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Reviews


What is the role of the arts in promoting a democratic culture? The Arts of Democracy, which originated in a conference at the Woodrow Wilson Center, attempts to answer that question in a dozen essays on subjects relating to the competing claims of “the public” and the free expression of individuals and communities. Editor Blake would like to see the volume affirming “on balance . . . the notion of a democratic public sphere as a regulative ideal and a resource for political criticism,” (3) but the collection itself demonstrates the real contradictions and tensions in the practice of public art, which emerges, inevitably, as a contested zone. The term itself—“the public”—is anything but simple, and what is in one instance idealized as the shared democracy of the “public sphere” can also, in other circumstances, be seen as a beast fed and nurtured by the media and the state, as when considerations of public interest (e.g., the preservation of aesthetic integrity) are used to repress freedom of speech in places such as the Washington Mall (see Leslie Prosterman’s essay).

The concept of “public art” is equally complex. Thus, Michele Bogart reads Norman Rockwell as a great “public artist,” by reason of his giving the public what it wanted. That point is implicitly countered by Casey Blake’s examination of the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), which celebrates the liberal-modernist project (from 1969 to 1989) of giving the public, not what it wanted but what it needed—namely, great works of sculpture in public spaces. The dismantling of Serra’s Tilted Arc signaled the turn away from that policy, and Blake decries the current popularity of neo-patriotic public sculpture (NEA running as far away from Mapplethorpe and Serrano as it can go). More controversially he argues that the “community arts movement” achieves local participation, but “at the cost of any aspiration to a cosmopolitan, democratic culture for the nation as a whole.” (214)

The history of the NEA is also central to Michael Kammen’s essay, “Culture and the State,” which compares it to the National Endowment for the Humanities, with its
increasingly emphasized state-based dissemination programs. Kammen argues importantly for what he calls “cultural federalism,” government support for the arts and humanities based on collaboration rather than the earlier New Deal model, with its top-down supply of the arts to the passively consuming public.

Standing somewhat apart from these historical studies is the more theoretical argument of Kenneth Cmiel, who holds that we must not confuse the whimsy of postmodernist art with the everyday need to create order and coherence in our lives; instead, we must separate the public sphere from the aesthetic, for otherwise we perpetuate the disconnect between politics and people. Other chapters can only be noted: Neil Harris (on music festivals), Vera L. Zolberg (comparing France and America), Laura A. Belmonte (art as Cold War propaganda), Penny M. von Eschen (on Duke Ellington as cultural ambassador) Donna M. Binkiewicz (on the NEA), Paul DiMaggio and Bethany Bryson (on public attitudes toward the arts), and Sally M. Promey (on public display of religion). Covering the period from the late nineteenth century to the recent past, The Arts of Democracy is illustrated (basic B & W) and would be a valuable resource for interdisciplinary courses in Public Art, Public Space, and Public History.

Temple University

Miles Orvell


Udo Hebel begins this German-language introduction to our interdisciplinary field with a familiar question, drawn from Janice Radway’s provocative 1998 ASA presidential address—“What’s in a name?”—and crafts a meticulously executed, 478-page answer that is always mindful of nomenclature, scholarly scope, and institutional imperatives. The title of the work contains two options, “Amerikanistik” and “American Studies.” “Amerikanistik” acknowledges the analogy to the study of other linguistic/cultural groups (“bezeichnet als Analogiebildung zu Philologien wie Anglistik, Germanistik, Romanistik den universitären Studiengang”) and marks the field as the systematic study of the language and literature of the United States (“Wissenschaft von Sprache und Literatur der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika”), a powerful designation in the German university system. “American Studies” proclaims an allegiance with the domestic, U.S. configuration of the field as an investigation, across disciplinary lines, of the totality and complexity of cultural productions, processes, and institutions in the U.S. (“der Gesamtheit und Vielfalt der kulturellen Produktionen, Prozesse und Institutionen in den USA”). Thus Hebel embraces both the classic definition of American Studies, as articulated by Henry Nash Smith in his 1957 American Quarterly article, and the turbulent history of the field, both its institutional formations and its interactions with the culture, particularly from the 1960s onward. Thus, the double name substantiates the field in the German university system and establishes an interdisciplinary focus for both teaching and research. A lot is invested in a name, it turns out, particularly outside the United States where the study of American culture(s) has to compete with other, compelling interdisciplinary enterprises—European Studies and Transatlantic Studies, for example—on the shifting terrain of post-Bologna European Union universities.

This is the finest, most systematic, university-level, single-authored introduction to American Studies that I know of. Throughout, Hebel defines terms (“Zum Begriff”) through references in both German and English. He offers students opportunities for further exploration (“Zur Vertiefung”) through enticing excerpts, lists, and chronologies. The text begins with an overview of resources and ends with a very useful bibliography. In my
experience teaching in universities within the European Union, it appears to me that Hebel intends first year or second year students as his main audience. A useful recapitulation of American cultural history, almost 150 pages long, would certainly give undergraduates plenty to hang on to but might be repetitive for some advanced students who might use it as a reference tool. His discussion of ideologies and identity construction is the foundation for a full American Studies curriculum: freedom, democracy, and individualism; the frontier thesis; pluralism; the land of unbounded opportunity, the self-made man, and the protestant work ethic; the immigrant nation between melting pot and multi-ethnicity; and a section on exceptionalism and the virtually untranslatable “Sendungsbewusstsein” (“consciousness of mission” doesn’t capture the missionary zeal) among them. Later on, a full chapter reviews the major approaches to the study of American culture, from the Myth/Symbol School to post-structuralist approaches, the fracturing of perspective caused by the culture wars of the 1980s, and the current vogue of transnationalism. Leading the student into the text is a strategically-placed cultural mapping of the United States: basic understandings of “America” pass through the interdisciplinary filter of landscape study before the term itself is problematized in the rest of the text.

The qualities of Hebel’s book stand in higher relief through comparison with a popular text currently in use in universities in Europe and beyond, American Civilization, the 5th edition (only the 4th, 2005, was available to me) issued in 2009. Because this is an English-language text, it can be marketed more widely, but it loses Hebel’s focus. While David Mauk, the principal author, does cover major themes in American culture, he provides little historical context; because Hebel’s text is written for an audience with which the author is familiar, there is a more confident “Fachlichkeit” (roughly, substance pertaining to the field) throughout. Because American Studies is configured differently in university systems throughout the world, Mauk does not address the issue of field formation but elaborates one manifestation of American Studies. In a different context, the word “civilization” would have become the subject of inquiry, no doubt by Hebel, had he referred to the term. Hebel wants readers to know where the field came from, what its intellectual traditions and modes of inquiry are, and how it is configured at the university level, both in the U.S. and in Germany. Interestingly, he finds the roots of American Studies in Germany in the scholarship of Max Weber and in the pre-World War I interest in the United States as a potential competitor, a field which an Austrian colleague has wryly named Enemy Studies (“Feindekunde”). Mauk ignores Radway’s question because, presumably, his readers are not committed enough to the subject to be concerned with it. Hebel takes the question on board, offering the most substantive articulation of “American Studies” from an international perspective that I have read.

Perhaps, as David Nye wrote in the ASA Newsletter shortly after the Radway address, international scholars and teachers are more aware of the coherence of “American culture” and, with it, the institutional weight of “American Studies,” than those of us who live in the United States. In any case, it is worth pondering that the most successful study presenting itself as a textbook—those who have used American history textbooks will recognize the layout of text, annotation, illustration, excerpt, and elaboration—has been written by an eminent international scholar in a language other than English. Perhaps, domestic users would feel uncomfortable at the relatively brief reference to Martin Luther King Jr. on page 201 or the scant elaboration of Native American literature three pages later, even though Hebel weaves both King’s influence and Native American perspectives into themes throughout the text. Perhaps the subject of religion in American life receives attention more befitting the long international fascination with this subject than domestic interest. Certainly Hebel’s attention to the political structures of the United States has not been
duplicated by domestic texts. It would be easy to say that this book should be translated. Indeed, it should, but in so doing it needs to be redirected to a larger audience without duplicating the elementary approach that Mauk has already employed. Ambitiously, we could consider the sort of reading list—primary and secondary material, as already sampled by Hebel—that would accompany such an effort. Finally, there is the question why such a book does not already exist for use in the United States. We have anthologies, collections of essays, even Web sites, but no book that is directed to the sort of university audience for which Hebel writes. Udo Hebel, who, miraculously, wrote this book while serving time as a central administrator at the University of Regensburg, is aware how his book could help anchor American Studies in a changing German university environment and recruit students to an exciting interdisciplinary field. In the turmoil of the contemporary American university climate, we could do well to recruit this Einführung to our cause.

University of Wyoming

Eric J. Sandeen


Readers inclined to pick up this anthology of place-based cultural essays will likely believe already, with editors Timothy R. Mahoney and Wendy J. Katz, that “the regionalist impulse is still very much alive.” (ix) If the case for such an impulse had ever been in doubt, then it should have been strengthened by the previous appearance of such similar anthologies as Edward Ayers, et al.’s All over the Map: Rethinking American Regions (Baltimore, 1995) and Andrew Cayton and Susan Gray’s The Identity of the American Midwest: Essays on Regional History (Bloomington, 2007). At a more material level, it has found confirmation in the National Endowment for the Humanities’ (NEH) 1999 commitment to funding ten centers devoted to regional study of the humanities. Like the University of Mississippi’s Center for the Study of Southern Culture—headed by folklorist William Ferris before his accession to the NEH directorship in 1997—these academically based centers based their existence on the assumption that cultural regions, even in an age of globalization and cultural homogenization, continued to provide a meaningful unit of study for scholars of literature, history, and the arts.

One of the centers that eventually resulted from the endowment’s widely publicized initiative, the Plains Humanities Alliance at the University of Nebraska served in 2003 as host for the first meeting of a consortium of the new agencies. The result of those proceedings is Mahoney and Katz’s edited volume, a varied collection of essays that should provoke the interest not only of scholars tracing the intellectual foundations of American regionalism, but also of those whose interests turn more specifically to such topics as midwestern literature and American architectural history. This is, in other words, a grab bag, a mix of broad and narrow explorations across a range of conventionally defined fields. Yet Regionalism and the Humanities coheres, better than most, as a sustained exploration of a broad and worthwhile theme.

Katz and Mahoney help to strike the right note in their introduction, asserting a place for regionalist thinking amidst the “ongoing erosion of space and place” as distinctive elements of our cultural self-definition (ix) and cautioning, rightly, against crossing from that commitment into one of the “varieties of essentialism” (xvii) that have in the past resulted in excesses of both romanticism and barbarism. Finally, their note that “any regionalist discourse...is a performance” (xi) helps to highlight the common thread within a number of the pieces to follow: If culture reflects and promotes important regional differences, and if, at the same time, we can dismiss the archaic idea that it naturally inheres to place, then...
it makes sense to look at regional culture as a shifting, historically contingent interaction of people, extant cultural artifacts, and places.

The “performance” of place is at times quite explicit in Regionalism and the Humanities, as in Nicolas S. Witschi’s examination of a mock shootout in Paradise, Nevada, in 1876; or in William Slaymaker’s defense of “ec(h)ological conscience,” which the author defines as the act of “projecting the conscious and conscientious self into an unconscious environment” (28) through literary and other means; or in Patrick Lee Lucas’s analysis of Greek Revival architecture as an example of “cultural work performed by the settlers” of the trans-Appalachian West (275); or in Guy Reynolds’s study of the “self-fashioning” (79) of Willa Cather and other place-conscious writers of the early twentieth century. Other contributions, less specifically related in their methodology, share the notion that region is a concept continually reinvented through the interaction of physical spaces and human acts. Their varied theses will prove compelling to varied audiences: Ginette Aley’s insistence on “internal histories” (96) as the defining elements of regional identity will serve some researchers, just as Edward Watts’s opposing focus on “larger international processes” (169) will attract others. Annie Proulx’s keynote essay on landscape and fiction (which includes a surprising dismissal of the work of J. B. Jackson) will find its adherents, as will—for quite different reasons—Cheryl Glotfelty’s contrarian claim for the continued cultural significance of state boundaries. Absent the close focus or tight argument required of a monograph, Mahoney and Katz’s anthology ranges freely across thematic and geographical territory, proving a worthy companion to other books of its kind and confirming that the “regionalist impulse” is very much alive among scholars of American humanities.

Indiana University


The introduction, conclusion and some very insistent dust-jacket copy for this book—a volume of essays written chiefly by political scientists—announce its relevancy to our moment. The development of European views of the United States, the editors remind us, has special meaning when Bush’s War on Terror has discredited the U.S. for many Europeans, and when American global hegemony is under debate and under attack. This is certainly true, but it is also true that these essays on the plural meanings of America for the European imagination are sufficiently interesting in their own right.

The volume includes a thoughtful overview essay by Alan Levine that surveys and theorizes the idea of America for European political thinkers from Contact to 9/11. The essays that follow cover a range of texts from Raynal’s Histoire des deux Indes to G.K. Chesterton’s 1922 What I Saw in America; many of the essays intersect in the 1830s America that Tocqueville visited. In choosing their materials our editors have “sought to underscore the complexity of European experiences of America as well as the complexity of European reflections on America” (5). Taken together, these materials constitute “an illuminating dialogue about American exceptionalism.” (7)

Several thematic preoccupations persist in French and British commentary on the United States; these unify the volume and illustrate that the cult of American exceptionalism has long had its European votaries. The essays demonstrate how, as Levine puts it, “America has since its discovery served as an imagined alternative, for good or ill, to the existing reality of Europe” (38). Indeed many of the European writers who have concerned
themselves with this imagined alternative did so without the benefit of actually traveling to North America. The ironies associated with an imaginary America present themselves throughout the volume; they are developed most provocatively in Costica Bradatan’s “Notes on Bishop Berkeley’s New World.” Consistently, too, European commentators have talked about America as if it were an historical condition, not just a place. From Berkeley’s Bermudas as the “fifth act” of empire’s drama to the “golden age” of liberty and toleration that Voltaire imagined was underway in William Penn’s woods, America is imagined as a when as well as a where.

Americanists in many fields may value these essays most for what they have to teach us about Alexis de Tocqueville. Christine Dunn Henderson frames and explores Tocqueville’s relative silence on American slavery through a discussion of Gustave de Beaumont, Tocqueville’s traveling companion, whose Marie; or, Slavery in the United States was published in 1835 with Democracy in America. Tocqueville is also collated with Victor Jacquemont, whose views of American social leveling anticipate his own, and with Victor Schoelcher, whose call for immediate abolition contrasts with Tocqueville’s gradualism.

With errors in grammar, usage, and typography, the volume is less tidily presented than most academic books this reader sees. America Through European Eyes is nevertheless a distinguished and illuminating collection.

Lake Forest College

Benjamin Goluboff


Werner Sollors has cultivated a distinctive habit of sculpting new arguments from rutted and well-traveled key words. “Descent,” “consent,” “ethnicity,” and “thematic criticism” are certainly not his creations but Sollors has often reconfigured them like an urban planner who makes a familiar place appear as a newly invented city. Indeed, his explanation of the term “invention” in the 1989 essay “The Invention of Ethnicity” is exemplary of this habit, which results from the pedestrian finesse of Sollors’s prose: its arrangements are direct yet fluid, its vocabulary repetitious yet heterodox, and its arguments explore tangents of familiar themes that were forgotten or dismissed.

Ethnic Modernism attempts to do for “modernism” what Sollors has done for those previously cited keywords. What is most interesting about this particular example is that Sollors’s must consider the term in relation to his own prior writings on it. The words “modern,” modernity,” and “modernism” recur often in Sollors’s early works, where they rarely synonymous. For example, the sub-title of his first monograph, published in 1978 with the title Amiri Baraka/Leroi Jones: The Quest for a “Populist Modernism,” invoked the Symbolist tradition of using the poor, the ethnic, the racial underclass as its subject. In that work Sollors represented Jones/Baraka as a “black Baudelaire” using modernist literary technique to engage matters of racial identity. The book oriented Sollors’s career towards what he then rightly considered to be an undervalued relationship between modernist aesthetics and sociological categories of ethnicity and race. Over several decades of writing, the former came to trouble the latter. While explaining the term “ethnicity” in a later essay, Sollors distinguished between a medieval “ethnic” past and modernist dissociation from it. More recently, Sollors stressed in an introduction to Dumas’ novel Georges that unlike Dumas’ contemporary readers, “modern” readers would require footnotes to explain certain 19th century allusions. Time, subjectivity, irony, society, interpretation, reception: each seems to inflect “modernism” in a different way. They also conflict with one another, leaving many questions unresolved. Was modernism an
anti-ethnic and anti-racial force? Had modernism disrupted the recovery of ethnic history or made it possible?

Ethnic Modernism engages the opportunity to follow these matters which had come to resemble traffic jams. There is a powerful dynamic at work in the title Ethnic Modernism insofar as the first term represents the principal avenue of his career and the second resembles an unpaved and neglected side street. Beginning with the book’s introductory essay, Sollors stresses the simple but important distinction between the standard definition of modernity as “sociological and technological developments” and the “aesthetic movements” of modernism. (10) This distinction does not aim to merely invert cause (modernity) and effect (modernism); rather, Sollors uses examples of mass transit to connect the chapters, forming a grid, as it were, of recurring and interlocking points. The book’s narrative will often turn on these points and move the work in a new direction.

The setting is a large city. It is any and every city. Stein’s Lena rides hopelessly on a streetcar, Saroyan’s narrator observes morbid subway faces. In a short sketch by Mary Antin a streetcar conductor scolds two littering Italian children. Faulkner’s narration in The Sound and the Fury becomes a “stream of consciousness trolley” (122) and “transport” becomes a trope for the neo-mystical modernism of Jean Toomer’s prose. The examples are pervasive. Henry Roth, Mike Gold, Richard Wright, and Leo Szilard are also invoked, to name only a few of the ethnic modernists who turned the “streetcar settings” of modernity into aesthetic boundary-crossing. But where the aesthetics of an early ethnic modernism hoped that modernity could be turned against itself, the technologies of modernity eventually prevail by reinforcing segregation, internment, and imprisonment. It is truly a binary relationship, in the literal sense of the word, which means a pair of railway tracks, on which pre-WWI modernism and modernity travel towards an eventual Cold War collision.

The book’s second chapter concludes with Sollors’s assessment that Gertrude Stein “had set up a model for literature that would be both “ethnic” and “modern;” (34) the following chapter begins with Stein’s “gentle Lena” weeping on a streetcar. Turning from the general, main argument to a secondary road, he writes: “Where immigration restrictionists and liberal reformers alike discussed ethnic heterogeneity in terms of the problems imposed by crime, health, housing conditions, and poverty, the representative ethnic texts of the period were typically written by American immigrants and their descendants and my members of minorities who not only claimed America but also stressed the fact that they had “made it.” (43) The quotation marks signal a subdued irony: the triumph of early modernist ethnic writing is increasingly tempered by ugly reminders that its union with modernism was a hazardous one. “Ethnic” success sacrificed more often than not the unique cultural vantages (and disadvantages) from which modernism received fresh infusions of heterodoxy. Once diminished, modernity then takes over, homogenizing modernism into a normative plot of assimilation and disillusion.

Readers may recognize a refurbished version of the dynamic between “descent” and “consent” from Sollors’s famous 1986 book Beyond Ethnicity: Consent and Descent in American Culture. In that work, “descent” signified differential ethnic affiliation and “consent” a uniform, civic identity. Their relationship assumes a cautionary, critical tone in the current work. Ethnic Modernism becomes a history of how the ethnic writer who ventures out from a medieval, tribal past and into the modern streets carries a double-edged sword (the two chapters dedicated to the writings of Mary Astin are exemplary in this respect). This tragic note resonates throughout Ethnic Modernism as immigrants return to their native lands, tensions erupt between authentic and ghostwritten narratives, or inter-generational conflicts combust within ethnicities and races. The combustions carry
through light, nearly comical discussions of ethnic literatures written in other languages, their polyglot hope recoiling from modernity as if in shock (which is literally the case in Sollors’s discussion of Henry Roth’s *Call It Sleep*).

Originally printed as “Prose Writing 1910-1950” in *The Cambridge History of American Literature*, (2002) *Ethnic Modernism* has now been reprinted as a separate monograph. As such it joins Robert Ferguson’s *The American Enlightenment: 1750-1820* and Jonathan Arac’s *American Literary Narrative: 1820-1860* among the better sections reprinted from that work. *Ethnic Modernism* also counts as one of the more thoughtful and polemical revaluations of the “modern” in recent years. As Fredric Jameson’s *A Singular Modernity* (2002) reconsidered the ontology of its subject, Sollors succeeds in doing the same for modernism in this monograph. And where Jameson’s book might be compared to Hausmann widening the boulevards during the reconstruction of Paris, Sollors’s more closely resembles Robert Moses’ reconfiguration of New York City: we recognize its streets, but the signs have all changed.

University of North Carolina Chapel Hill

Henry Veggian


Immigration is a very timely topic, one with an increasing influence on American politics and notions of, in the words of media scholar Michele Hilmes, who we are and who we are not. In this smart, well-researched and eminently readable yet intellectually complex book, Rachel Rubin and Jeffrey Melnick put popular culture at the center of that definition, focusing upon the consumption, production, and imagery around immigration and popular culture in order to “offer a road map of the cultural imagination of immigration.” This it does, and more.

In a series of roughly chronological case studies, beginning with Italian and Jewish gangster films of the 1930s and culminating with Asian Americans in cyberspace in the 2000s, with several other different types of media texts in-between, Rubin and Melnick analyze the integration of immigration and popular culture as a process of masquerade, analyzing both what lies behind the mask that is the popular culture text, as well the motivations and construction of the mask itself. The case studies focus on different types of popular culture texts including film, Broadway, popular music, journalism, clothing (the zoot suit of the 1940s) and media platforms (turntables, the internet). Although they do not focus on black/white relations, they do “read” immigration narratives and imagery through that history, providing a richness and depth to their analysis and discussion. The authors pay close and particular attention to historical and social context, thereby foregrounding the cultural history of immigration as read though media texts.

A work of this sort cannot cover everything, and the focus on representation of particular ethnic groups in popular culture can have the effect of wiping out real distinctions within those groups, for example, Asians or Asian Americans. At the same time, the book is so clearly written and methodologically focused that it provides inspiration and an excellent model for students and readers to pursue their own studies of groups or texts that are omitted in this volume. A thornier omission is that of representation of Native Americans, technically outside of the scope of the book but a group whose representation in popular culture demands continued interrogation. Also missing is an in-depth study of a television text, although that omission in itself says much about the potential object of study.
Immigration and Popular Culture: An Introduction is an excellent and very necessary contribution to American Studies and to the understanding of the complex and important relationship between the two topics in its title. The authors make visible a relationship that, as they argue, imbues and indeed has built American popular culture and will continue to renew and create it. Immigration and Popular Culture is a very lucid and instructive model of how to do interdisciplinary media studies, suitable for use as a key text for an undergraduate course, or as a methodological model for graduate students in American studies, media studies, or cognate fields.

University of Western Ontario (Canada)

Norma Coates


Marta Caminero-Santangelo’s thought-provoking second book might be more aptly titled On Latinidades, as it contests the idea of a monolithic, static latinidad. In dialogue with Latino/a Studies scholars like Earl Shorris, Suzanne Oboler, Debra Castillo, and Juan Flores, Caminero-Santangelo enumerates the problems elicited by the umbrella term “Latino/a.” She underscores how this label can essentialize and homogenize different groups, obscuring and silencing their distinct histories; and she emphasizes how such obfuscation and suppression are inaccurate, dangerous, and violent. She outlines “common denominators” that allegedly unite these groups under the category “Latino/a” and debunks these, claiming that the notion of a single Hispanic race is absurd, that the idea of a common language—Spanish—makes no sense since not all Latinos/as speak Spanish, and that “national identity has always trumped continental identity in the home countries.” (20) Despite the problems of panethnic classification, Caminero-Santangelo comes to “accept and use” the term “Latino/a.” (32)

Because the term “has acquired very real meaning and power in U.S. public discourse,” Caminero-Santangelo maintains: “those named by the category must [ . . . ] engage with it somehow.” (32) Caminero-Santangelo, drawing on Stephen Cornell, Douglas Hartmann, and Homi Bhabha’s writings, argues that the invoked narrative of shared histories of U.S. intervention in Latin America has been pivotal in constructing latinidad. (21) Adopting a social constructionist approach to identity formation, she asserts that the category “Latino/a” can be useful, particularly when engaging in a comparative study of multiple groups subsumed under the label and when discussing differences among these. She, like Felix Padilla, argues that the category can be deployed for strategic purposes, to build coalitions and foster a “sense of ‘connectedness.’” (21) The thrust of her argument is that it is important, and indeed ethically responsible, to unite under the umbrella term in the name of solidarity as long as differences are recognized.

Building on Karen Christian’s analysis of the construction of latinidad, Caminero-Santangelo focuses on the boundaries of latinidad, exploring who gets included and excluded under said category. (31) She turns to literature, primarily fiction, to see “how Latino/a narratives represent (or do not represent) various collectivities implicit in the social construction of ‘Latinoness.’” (32) Marketed as “the first book to address head-on the question of how Latino/a literature wrestles with the pan-ethnic and trans-racial implications of the ‘Latino’ label,” On Latinidad illustrates how works by Rudolfo Anaya, Piri Thomas, Julia Alvarez, Cristina Garcia, Achy Obejas, Ana Castillo, Margarita Engle, Elías Miguel Muñoz, Alisa Valdes-Rodriguez, Ana Menéndez, and Demetria Martinez do not tend to represent a unified pan-latinidad. Instead, these narratives tend to focus on one nationality and/or highlight fissures among Latinos/as to which, Caminero-
Santangelo argues, we need to be attuned. Ultimately, Caminero-Santangelo encourages readers to think about *latinidad* as a hyphenated space between various Latino/a alliances, a space that involves a commitment to acknowledging differences and fighting for solidarity. (217-219)

**Laura Halperin**


Leora Auschlander believes that “history can be made by objects, rituals, and practices” and “changes in culture . . . can be a motor of change.” (13) *Cultural Revolutions* exploits these important insights, which Auslander has developed in her previous work on early modern France, in a comparison of the English Revolution in the 1640s and 1650s, the American Revolution, and the French Revolution.

In each case, Auslander asserts, “the accessibility of consumer good, and the increasingly sophisticated advertising used to sell them, provided a new way of thinking about the place of objects in the construction of social meaning.” (5) The all-too-brief sections in which she uses concrete examples to illustrate shifts in individual, social, and national identity are excellent. The study of the quotidian reveals suggestive parallels in early modern revolutions, particularly the powerful role of material culture in the disintegration of monarchical legitimacy. Consumer choice was a political act. Puritans in the 1640s wore clothes whose aesthetic of straight lines and simplicity amounted to a striking rebuke to the artificiality of the Stuart courts. Something similar occurred in North America in the 1760s and 1770s with the widespread embrace of homespun.

In England, America, and France, the logic of consumer choice was pivotal in the triumph of republics. Ironically, it also created the “fundamental conundrum” of “the modern nation-state:” a reliance on “affective bonds that are most effectively made through culture” focused attention on who was and who was not a citizen and forced white males (or their descendants) to expand their political community in ways they had never imagined. (148) At the intersection of political revolution and cups and saucers lay questions about the public and the private, coercion and consent, and women and men.

Unfortunately, Auslander’s fascinating ideas are embedded in an awkward book. Her comparative framework—an introduction and conclusion with an essay on each revolution—is at cross-purposes with her argument. Much of this relatively short volume is necessarily devoted to establishing what happened, to generalizing broadly and then qualifying those generalizations. (The fact that an abundance of secondary sources forms the foundation of *Cultural Revolutions* calls into question Auslander’s claim that “the concept of ‘cultural revolution’ itself—which implies a complex relation between such political transformations, culture, and emotions—has attracted little attention.” (1))

While I recognize the advantages of a comparative approach, I am skeptical of political revolutions as an organizing principle. Why not make an argument about the meanings of material culture in the North Atlantic World from the middle of the seventeenth through the nineteenth centuries in which political events are consciously subordinated to social and cultural change? Auslander’s wonderful questions and innovative method seem to demand that we rethink not only our sources but our categories of historical analysis, including the extent to which constructing books about around traditional political revolutions inhibits our ability to see trans-national patterns within a global narrative.

**Andrew Cayton**

Miami University

Through exhaustive research, historian Michael S. Sherry’s *Gay Artists in Modern American Culture* argues that predominantly white gay men found themselves at the epicenter of national and international public debates over the United State’s cultural preeminence during the Cold War era. These men—composers such as Aaron Copland and Samuel Barber as well as dramatists such as Tennessee Williams and Edward Albee—were considered members in an imaginary homintern (a pun on Comintern, the Communist International) that was held to both exemplify and undermine the nation’s attempts at cultural imperialism. Think of it as an arms race with treble clefs directed by Maggie the Cat. For Sherry, these artists exemplified the United States high cultural achievement through the circulation of their major productions in opera, drama, literature, and film. Yet they nevertheless undermined these achievements because of their stigmatized gay-identifications, thereby effeminizing the self-image of a masculinist Cold War nation-state. Sherry convincingly supports this paradoxical thesis through close readings of Richard Nixon’s transcripts, plays such as *Suddenly, Last Summer, Cat on a Hot Tin Roof,* and *Who’s Afraid of Virginia Woolf?*, homophobic critiques by Stanley Kauffman, and, brilliantly, the spectacular failure of Samuel Barber’s opera 1966 *Antony and Cleopatra* (directed by Franco Zeffirelli) at New York City’s Metropolitan Opera. As this detailed list suggests, the accomplishments of *Gay Artists* are many. First, Sherry enables scholars to review queer American modernist works in both a national and an international frame and provides a strong overarching thesis for braiding these disparate artists into a thick cultural weave. Second, his book overflows with anecdotal evidence that not only makes good use of its case studies but also incorporates an astonishing range of references to support its layered arguments. An incomplete list would include not only the white gay males already listed, but also Audre Lorde, James Baldwin, Susan Sontag, Stephen Sondheim, Leslie Fiedler, Erving Goffman, Andy Warhol, Jasper Johns, Joseph McCarthy, Roy Cohn, Lyndon Johnson, Montgomery Clift, Rock Hudson, and John Cage. Third, Sherry tracks the afterlife of talk surrounding the national value of queer creativity as it continues well into the present. And fourth, the historian is admirably self-reflexive about his own positioning in relation to his research, oftentimes linking his archival analyses to personal biography and thereby avoiding the trap of an impossible objectivity. *Gay Artists in Modern Culture* is highly recommended for scholars—and also for non-academics—who have interests in twentieth-century American culture, in queer studies, and in studies of modern U.S. empire. It should become a vital reference for those studying how these three interconnected subjects collided in sound, in print, on celluloid, and on the stage during the pivotal decades of the Cold War era. *Gay Artists* recently won the 2008 LGBT Award for Nonfiction from the Lambda Literary Foundation. It deserves to pick up several more.

Indiana University Bloomington

Scott Herring


In early printing houses, devils were lowest-rung apprentices who did odd-jobs, like pulling sheets from the press and redistributing set type, both of which gave these lads an inky patina. If the devils worked hard, and were receptive to the education senior workers gave them, and were lucky, they might rise to become masters.
Bruce Michelson’s *Printer’s Devil* boldly casts Samuel Clemens in this role, while playing upon its meaning. Yes, young Sam was a devil, typographically speaking, as a fetching occupational daguerreotype testifies (6). In it, Clemens looks devilish, too, with a proud glimmer in his eye, and *a tromp l’oeil* in his hand: his name rendered on a composing stick in defiance of the medium’s characteristic image reversal. Such mechanical devilry continued in later life, as seen in his Faustian obsession with perfecting the hopelessly complex Paige typesetter, which cost him his fortune. Had it succeeded in the market it may have bedeviled the compositors whose jobs it would replace and whose unreliable work habits and unpredictable strikes, according to Michelson, contributed to “money-gobbling expenses in getting [Clemens’s] own books through the publishing process.” (12) There was devilry in Clemens’s writing, too, in its wicked sarcasm, personae manipulations (the pseudonymous “Mark Twain” may have been his greatest invention), and deft language use, treacherous to the naive and gullible, the too-innocent and overly precious.

And there were literal devils in Twain’s writing. Perhaps the most telling occurs in his “Mysterious Stranger,” set in a fifteenth-century print shop frequented by an all-seeing, if nihilistic stranger, oddly enough named Satan, who edifies the workers with the startling conclusion that nothing is real but the narrator’s “Thought, ‘Wandering forlorn among the empty eternities’” (218). Michelson reads this “Mark Twain dream of Samuel Clemens,” in transit from printer’s devil to media mogul to inefficacious “public identity,” as “contrived and promulgated with printed language that inevitable alienates and objectifies the dream” (220, 223). Coming to consciousness of these slippery ontological slopes of the printed page, the narrator avers the truth of nothingness beyond the thought and appropriately ends the story.

Michelson’s dazzling display of such cultural poetics throughout his book is thought provoking. It quickly dispels any suspicion that perhaps printing, whether as initial inspiration, shaping influence, or simple synecdoche, was not as central to Clemens as Michelson claims. Much to the author’s credit, the reader wants it to be so, even if he or she should know better.

Take the phrase “American publishing revolution,” for example. It is key to Michelson’s argument, not only concerning the centrality of print, but for his many attempts to link that media revolution with today’s. Yet was there such a revolution? No other scholars have used the phrase, and with good reason: there was little revolutionary about such old media probably at any time in American history, but especially during Clemens’s adulthood, when the publishing industry struggled mightily to survive. The “American publishing revolution” thus resembles one of those substance-less thoughts albeit, with textually constitutive power, to which the Mysterious Stranger alludes. Jettisoning that thought might diminish the book’s contemporary relevance only to highlight the chaotic publishing environment, limned well by Michelson, out of which printer-devil Clemens rose to become Twain, the exceedingly devilish master writer.

University of Pittsburgh

Ronald J. Zboray


Steve Fraser, the author of the *Every Man A Speculator*, the best long cultural history of Wall Street, has now written the best short history, *Wall Street: America’s Dream Palace*. 
Fraser has chosen to frame his short cultural history with four congruent but intertwining essays on four “ideal typical” Wall Street characters: The Aristocrat (e.g. William Duer and J.P. Morgan), The Confidence Man (e.g. Mark Twain’s “Colonel Sellers” and the real-life Charles Ponzi), The Hero (e.g. Commodore Vanderbilt and Morgan, again), and The Immoralist (e.g. Jay Gould and Michael Milken). Each essay traverses a chronological sweep of a century or more; each introduces characters real-life and fictional; each draws comparisons and makes contracts between a then and a now; each segues artfully into the next.

This is not a traditional history. The ideal types we are presented with are amalgams, composite configurations. Writing in the tradition of Matthew Josephson—though without the ideological over-reach, Fraser moves effortlessly from real events and personages to their caricatured representations. He is not overly interested in cutting through the cultural baggage to get at the “real” J.P. Morgan, Daniel Drew, or Jay Gould, but with fastening our attention on the cultural resonance, reach, and signification of these truly larger-than-life characters. This is cultural history without apologies or regrets: its subject the iconic images of Wall Street, not its day-to-day operations. What we come away with is an understanding of how Wall Street—as a dream palace, alternately and often simultaneously celebrated and excoriated—has functioned to distract attention from the economic system it has sustained and defined for more than two centuries. It has always been more convenient—for politicians, the press, and the American public—to rail against the demons of Wall Street—aristocrats, confidence men, and immoralists alike—than to confront and condemn capitalism outright.

While there is much to appreciate in the telling of this tale, there were moments when I wished that Fraser had given us more history and less culture, moments when I got lost in his luxuriously overheated prose and wanted a reality check, an authorial voice to distinguish for me between the real-life tycoons and their fictional representations, between Michael Milken and Gordon Gecko. One was real, the other fictional, one did damage in the real world, the other did not. We gain a great deal by allowing one image to morph into the other, but do we not also lose something as well?

This is an ideal book for students in a wide variety of courses. It should be widely read and widely adopted. The author is, of course, to be commended, but so too Yale University Press, which has done a splendid job of publishing, and Mark Crispin Miller, the editor of the ICONS OF AMERICA series, who had the good sense to envision Wall Street as an American “icon” and commission Fraser to write about it.

City University of New York

David Nasaw


One of the major developments in ethnic studies over the past two decades has been the idea (and sometimes the advocacy) of multiraciality. From a theoretical perspective, this has stemmed from a post-structuralist attempt to deconstruct the categories created by the European Enlightenment and its colonial enterprise around the world. From a personal perspective, it has been driven by the life experiences in the last half-century of a growing number of people who have and acknowledge mixed parentage. The leading figures in this scholarly movement are probably Maria Root and G. Reginald Daniel, but the writers are many and include figures as eminent as Gary Nash and Randall Kennedy.

A small but dedicated group of writers has resisted this trend: chiefly Rainier Spencer, Jon Michael Spencer, and Lewis Gordon. They have raised no controversy, perhaps
because their books are not well written, and perhaps because their arguments do not make a great deal of sense. It is not that there is nothing wrong with the literature and the people movement surrounding multiraciality. Some writers and social activists do tend to wax rhapsodic about the glories of intermarriage and multiracial identity as social panacea. A couple of not-very-thoughtful activists (Charles Byrd and Susan Graham) have been co-opted by the Gingrichian right (to be fair, one must point out that most multiracialists are on the left). And, most importantly, there is a tension between some Black intellectuals and the multiracial idea over the lingering fear that, for some people, adopting a multiracial identity is a dodge to avoid being Black. If so, that might tend to sap the strength of a monoracially-defined movement for Black community empowerment.

With *Amalgamation Schemes*, Jared Sexton is trying to stir up some controversy. He presents a facile, sophisticated, and theoretically informed intelligence, and he picks a fight from the start. His title suggests that the study of multiraciality is some kind of plot, or at the very least an illegitimate enterprise. His tone is angry and accusatory on every page. It is difficult to get to the grounds of his argument, because the cloud of invective is so thick, and because his writing is abstract, referential, and at key points vague.

For Sexton (as for the Spencers and Gordon) race is about Blackness, in the United States and around the world. That is silly, for there are other racialized relationships. In the U.S., native peoples were racialized by European intruders in all the ways that Africans were, and more: they were nearly extinguished. To take just one example from many around the world, Han Chinese have racialized Tibetans historically in all the ways (including slavery) that Whites have racialized Blacks and Indians in the United States. So there is a problem with Sexton’s concept of race as Blackness. There is also a problem with his insistence on monoraciality. For Sexton and the others, one cannot be mixed or multiple; one must choose ever and only to be Black. I don’t have a problem with that as a political choice, but to insist that it is the only possibility flies in the face of a great deal of human experience, and it ignores the history of how modern racial ideas emerged.

Sexton does point out, as do many writers, the flawed tendencies in multiracial advocacy mentioned in the second paragraph above. But he imputes them to the whole movement and to the subject of study, and that is not a fair assessment.

The main problem is that Sexton argues from conclusion to evidence, rather than the other way around. That is, he begins with the conclusion that the multiracial idea is bad, retrograde, and must be resisted. And then he cherry-picks his evidence to fit his conclusion. He spends much of his time on weaker writers such as Gregory Stephens and Stephen Talty who have been tangential to the multiracial literature. When he addresses stronger figures like Daniel, Root, Nash, and Kennedy, he carefully selects his quotes to fit his argument, and misrepresents their positions by doing so.

Sexton also makes some pretty outrageous claims. He takes the fact that people who study multiracial identities are often studying aspects of family life (such as the shaping of a child’s identity), and twists that to charge them with homophobia and nuclear family-ism. That is simply not accurate for any of the main writers in the field. The same is true for his argument by innuendo that scholars of multiraciality somehow advocate mail-order bride services. And sometimes Sexton simply resorts to *ad hominem* attacks on the motives and personal lives of the writers themselves. It is a pretty tawdry exercise.

That is unfortunate, because Sexton appears bright and might have written a much better book detailing his hesitations about some tendencies in the multiracial movement. He might even have opened up a new direction for productive study of racial commitment amid complexity. Sexton does make several observations that are worth thinking about,
and surely this intellectual movement, like any other, needs to think critically about itself. Sadly, this is not that book.

University of California, Santa Barbara

Paul Spickard


The past few years have seen a number of new books on the history of American art, from fat surveys that span the centuries from the colonial era to the present day to more particular volumes that look at America’s visual and material cultures in terms of identity politics, the advent of modernism, the growth of the art market, the effects of mass media, etc. Making American Art pursues a slightly different tack. While still taking up the “perennial and vexing” question “what is American about American art?” (a query that even today is featured on graduate exams in the field), the book’s authors search for answers in the various cultural institutions that train America’s artists and promote and disseminate American art.

Driven by a thematic approach, Making American Art includes chapters on art education, art copying and reproduction, art tourism (Hiram Powers’s marble sculpture Greek Slave toured the country from 1847-1848 and was seen by over 100,000 people), the nation-building agenda of Western landscape painting (pictures by nineteenth-century artists including Albert Bierstadt and Thomas Moran are credited with helping spark interests in creating America’s national parks), the evolution of museums and collectors devoted to American art, and the history and practice of American art criticism and scholarship from William Dunlap’s History of the Rise and Progress of the Arts of Design in the United States (1834) to the plethora of “publishing machinery” (177) that exists today. The result, as the authors assert, is “an untidy history of American art,” a lively hodgepodge analogous with an equally unruly contemporary era that “lacks consensus” and “questions a contradictory and fractured heritage.” (5) Decontextualizing the fraught dynamics of nationalism, for example, including longstanding if uncritical assumptions of American exceptionalism set against the facts of geographical borders, acts of imperialism, and multiple and diasporic communities, helps to guide their project and, as they explain, “present a view that relates present disquiet and reassessments of the past triumphs of American art to a more complex history.” (13)

Making American Art provides a refreshing overview of the multiple kinds of labor—physical, intellectual, economic, political, social—that drive and define cultural production in the United States. While many different works of art are considered, from colonial era paintings to contemporary public sculpture, the book is more explicitly focused on their industrial and institutional underpinnings: the eighteenth-century art manuals that taught American limners how to paint; the plaster casts that nineteenth-century artists sketched and copied; the museums, print workshops, international art shows, associations, universities, and media operations that have shaped and directed modern and contemporary art. Refusing to reduce “the diversity of the past to a streamlined, manageable story,” (185) which the authors contend is the basic agenda of much art history, Making American Art offers a deliberately random narrative that will enthuse many readers, especially those already familiar with the field. It features an excellent bibliography, which is to be commended at a time when many publishers are eliminating such helpful resources for reasons of cost.

University of Notre Dame

Erika Doss
Photographic Memories comprises eight essays that meanderingly reflect upon the private mnemonic functions of photographs and, at greater length, the memory work images perform in the public sphere. Kroes’ opening essay—the book’s strongest and nearly its longest—is poignantly autobiographical, recounting the sudden death of his first wife and his anguished inability to find solace in the family photographic album in which he had documented his “dream . . . to have a happy family” (17) unlike the one he had grown up in. With his wife’s death, he writes, “the book had been closed.” (23) But several years later he remarries and his second wife encourages him to take out the album again and narrate to her the story of each photograph, and in doing so he must “rephrase their meaning” (24) for this new viewer. Seeing these pictures again and re-formulating their significance exhilarates him and permits him to integrate his former life with his new one. His account thus qualifies if not refutes Roland Barthes’ proposition that such photographs intrinsically convey to viewers a sense of irremediable loss. Photographs also possess, Kroes says, a “suturing power . . . to heal the wounds inflicted by history or the mere passage of time.” (5)

The Family of Man exhibition—seen by millions of viewers around the world following its 1955 premiere at the Museum of Modern Art—is Kroes’ example of photography’s suturing power evidencing itself in the public sphere, and much of his long essay on “Cold War Photography” is dedicated to a laudatory appraisal of the show. He argues that the Holocaust is the exhibition’s structuring absence inasmuch as Edward Steichen, its organizer, deliberately avoided depictions of Nazi atrocities but recontextualized the photographs he did include in such a way as to imbue “them with new meaning, connecting past trauma with future hopes.” The effect, he says, is to make the exhibition as a whole proclaim “a message of `Never Again.'” (127) Whatever one thinks of that interpretation—and I have doubts about it—its persuasiveness is compromised by Kroes’ failure to address adequately the many criticisms that have been directed at The Family of Man. Some have been of its ideology, critiques Kroes glancingly acknowledges but breezily dismisses as unoriginal, but others indict its disrespect for photographs’ integrity as the exhibition’s sequencing and captioning of several pictures inverted their makers’ intentions, its neo-primitivism and suppression of the transformations that modernity had brought about in most twentieth-century societies, and the condescending determination of its design to narrowly supervise viewers’ responses.

Other essays address portraits exchanged by nineteenth-century Dutch emigrants with their families in Holland (Kroes is a Dutch scholar of American culture), photography’s reception in Europe and America, the congruence of Mathew Brady’s and Stephen Crane’s Civil War depictions, and other similarly discrete topics. Photographic Memories is a pleasant read and includes a fair number of useful observations but they are insufficiently knitted together for it to compose an edifying whole.

University of Iowa

John Raeburn


It has been twenty years since Jeffrey Sammons wrote Beyond The Ring: The Role of Boxing in American Society, the last scholarly survey of pugilistic history. Although
both of these books take a different look at the fight game than Sammons did, neither of the works eclipses their predecessor’s analysis of the social and cultural impact of boxing.

The title of Boddy’s work is somewhat misleading because it is more a survey or annotated list of representations of boxing in art, literature, and film than a cultural history of the sport. The book’s value is in its breadth more than in its depth. Its nearly 400 pages of text exhaustively chronicle the various sites within the arts and humanities that boxing or fighting has appeared. Starting in ancient Greece, the book works its way through the British Middle Ages to the eighteenth century and Victorian Era before making its way to American shores. Over 150 illustrations, many of them beautifully presented, give readers an idea of how representations of boxing have evolved.

If there is a glaring omission from the book, it is its bypassing of the sport of boxing. The section about fight scenes in the work of Charles Dickens is as long as the section about Muhammad Ali. There is far more written about Norman Mailer than about the great contemporary heavyweight champions that informed his work—Floyd Patterson, George Foreman, Sonny Liston, and Joe Frazier. There are six pages on Ralph Ellison’s Invisible Man, but less than a page about Sugar Ray Robinson. While in itself there is nothing wrong with a focus on writers instead of fighters, it is not what one would expect from a book purporting to be a cultural history of boxing. Indeed, boxing is largely absent from the work. While scholars of boxing will find the book disappointing as a source of analysis, it is a useful reference collection that has conveniently gathered a very wide range of sources about boxing and fighting into one volume.

Fans of boxing will like Lang’s book better than Boddy’s, but scholars will find it woefully lacking in documentation and rigor. These deficiencies are partly a result of the book’s thesis, which is that boxing has always existed primarily as a vehicle for gambling. Lang relies often on rumor, hearsay, and reports from boxing’s underbelly to corroborate his thesis. While much of this narrative is believable, much of it is also impossible to prove, and Lang makes no effort to do so. Far more disturbing than Lang’s conjecture, however, is the seeming lack of copyediting or fact checking that went into the work. While in themselves the mistakes are not particularly important, their cumulative effect cheapens the work. Despite these flaws, boxing fans will find Lang’s perspective as a Las Vegas insider to be particularly intriguing. Lang tells stories about the gambling-based machinations surrounding various prizefights that even the most jaded boxing observers will find fresh and interesting.

Perhaps somewhere between the works of Kasia Boddy and Arne Lang lies an exemplary study of boxing and its peculiar cultural history. While Boddy’s work would have been better served by an increased focus on the sport itself and less effort toward exhaustively chronicling every last literary reference to the sport, Lang’s work would have benefited by a more serious look at the political and social contexts surrounding prizefighting.

Sonoma State University


As culture critic Roger Rosenblatt reminds us, “story-telling is what the human animal does, to progress, to learn to live with one another.” English professor Priscilla Wald analyzes a particular genre of recurring story, the account of the communicable disease outbreak, the history of which is especially compelling in light of contemporary concerns about HIV/AIDS, SARS, Avian Flu, and drug-resistant strains of tuberculosis.
She intends her interdisciplinary analysis of outbreak narratives to aid scholars in their understanding of disease’s impact upon society. Such understanding might then lead to “more effective, just, and compassionate responses both to a changing world and to the problems of global health and human welfare.” (3)

Outbreak narratives share a “formulaic plot,” according to Wald. Each narrative, whether in fact or fiction, begins with “the identification of an emerging infection, includes discussion of the global networks throughout which it travels, and chronicles the epidemiological work that ends with its containment.” (2) Wald begins in the midst of the bacteriological revolution which began in the late nineteenth century. In the treatment of Mary Mallon (a.k.a. Typhoid Mary) in the early twentieth century, Wald locates an early and culturally powerful factual outbreak narrative. George Soper, a clever epidemiologist traced typhoid deaths at a summer house to a female Irish immigrant cook, a healthy carrier, who is unwittingly spreading infection to those who ate food she prepared. It was an era before such phenomena were widely understood, and Mary’s insistence of innocence, her pursuit, and her detention in isolation arouses sympathy for both the dead and for Mary, who emerges as a victim of her own body and a fearful society.

Wald looks to similar historical narratives in the Cold War era and, more recently, in exchanges about the HIV/AIDS pandemic. In literature, Wald locates the outbreak theme in Michael Crichton’s *Andromeda Strain* (1969) and Richard Preston’s *Hot Zone* (1994). On the screen, there is *Invasion of the Body-Snatchers* (1956 and 1978 versions). These stories include a patient zero (the first to contract the disease), superspreaders, hot zones, and persistent pathogens, or invaders. Wald prods readers to consider how humans respond to the biological invasions of their bodies, especially by microorganisms. Her examples remind us that increasing human connectedness with its gift of shared information, also imperils us by the speed with which disease is spread.

Citing journalist Laurie Garrett’s *The Coming Plague* (1994), Wald suggest the possibility of a counter-narrative in which the world, with some humility, reconceptualizes humanity’s place in the Earth’s ecology and acts locally and globally to ensure every person’s right to the highest possible level of health through reform in the distribution of medical care and banishing the extreme poverty that triggers outbreaks of disease. Wald also sensitizes readers to how contagion spreads and whom it affects. She cautions against confusing disease and victim, hoping to diminish medicalized prejudice and stigma often assigned to sufferers.

*Contagious* is too rich in detail and cultural reference for most undergraduates, but scholars of American culture will applaud it. It is unlikely that Wald’s cultural critique with its plethora of examples from novels and films offers the kind of data that can alter America’s medical landscape, but thoughtful physicians, nurses, and public health workers who do encounter her book will never battle an “outbreak” without pondering how it might give rise to yet new cultural expressions, symbols, and social relationships.

American University

Alan M. Kraut


Cotten Seiler’s *Republic of Drivers* is an ambitious, intellectually impressive examination of how American intellectual and cultural elites looked to automobility to transform the anachronistic nineteenth-century individualism of Tocqueville and Emerson into one more compatible with the increasingly cooperative demands of life in twentieth-century America. Seiler focuses on two periods, the quarter century before 1920, when the pro-
prietary capitalism of the farm and small business gave way to corporate capitalism, and the 1950s, when individualism seemed just as threatened by the conformity of the national security state and corporate America as by the Soviet Union. “In these moments of danger that threatened capitalist-liberal hegemony by destabilizing its narrative of selfhood,” writes Seiler, “automobility performed a crucial restorative role by giving that selfhood a vital form conducive to the existing arrangement of power.” (3)

Seiler begins with the demise of the individualist conception of self rooted in production and shows how the celebration of consumer choice partially addressed the loss of workplace autonomy. In this context, the automobile got co-opted to resolve some of the tensions created by the emergence of the new cooperative order. Seiler sides with scholars who argue that Americans did not just adopt the automobile for its utility but “as a meliorative response to the crisis of legitimacy in turn-of-the-century capitalism brought about by the Taylorist transformation of production.” (41) But he suggests that driving, and not just buying a car, performed this compensatory function. “Driving’s sensations of agency, self-determination, entitlement, privacy, sovereignty, transgression, and speed . . .,” he writes, “were instrumental in establishing automobility as a public good.” (41) Driving brought safety problems and government intervention, so the state lent a hand to intellectuals and corporations in creating new subjects for a new order.

In his third chapter Seiler “considers the Interstate Highway System as a component of the postwar ‘practical affirmation’ of American values demanded by NSC-68 and other cold war rhetoric.” (71) He acknowledges the pressures from drivers, corporate interests, and the military to build the interstates, but argues that the Eisenhower administration succeeded in creating the impression that the interstates would be built simply to meet the traditional individual desire for mobility, while obscuring the state’s larger interest in creating citizens content with the postwar order. “Automobility performed crucial ideological work at this time,” writes Seiler, and the interstates “literally made concrete . . . individual freedom.” (104) Chapter four examines how the interstates provided a new driving experience for African Americans when used with tour books that told them where they could find services that welcomed their business. On the interstates African Americans were drivers first and treated equally by other Americans. Seiler concludes with a chapter on the experience of interstate driving and the role of highway engineers in “reconciling ‘competing claims and attractions of subjection and independence.’” (130)

With the automobile, gender is often close at hand. While Seiler pays close attention to gender, the everyday experiences of Americans with automobiles and driving often seem tangential to his main interest in how American conceptions of self as articulated by intellectual and cultural elites changed to serve the needs of corporate and state power. In this sense the book is more intellectual history in the older sense than cultural history, let alone one that focuses on popular culture. Indeed, Republic of Drivers harks back to the great 1950s popular social science explanations of American culture by Riesman, Mills, Whyte, and Potter. Seiler draws particular attention to Riesman’s idea of “autonomy” as “the reconciliation of one’s own desires with the necessity for the harmonious and moral functioning of a community.” (130-132) Autonomous individuals vote, buy things, and drive, accepting this delimited sphere of “freedom” without challenging the liberal-capitalist hegemony.

The primary source research behind Republic of Drivers is impressive for its breadth, depth, and handling. Seiler also draws heavily on the work of contemporary scholars. Yet the points that he introduces from these scholars are subordinated to his larger argument and provide an essential part of the history that he traces. Although the book often employs the specialist vocabulary of literary studies, Republic of Drivers is a rewarding read that
leaves you thinking after you finish it. It could be used with profit in an undergraduate seminar. I’ve also put Seiler on my short list of preferred companions for any cross-country road trip, confident that I’ll see America differently by the time that we get there.

United States Naval Academy

Tom McCarthy


Not surprisingly, the inventor of the Kewpie doll hails from the Branson area, which Aaron Ketchell portrays not only as a place convinced of its sacrality but of its homogenous theology. Described by a local minister as “America the way it ought to be” (102), Ketchell also reveals a darker side, reflected in a statement from country music legend Merle Haggard: “If you don’t believe as they do, then you’re just out” (xiv).

Locating Branson in the regional phenomenon created by Harold Bell Wright’s 1907 novel The Shepard of the Hills—a testament to homespun morality and the Edenic quality of the Ozarks—Ketchell describes the residents’ local pride, anti-institutional religiosity, and anti-modernism (including anti-urbanism and nativism), and how they construct, maintain, and profit from their notions of the region’s sacrality. He carefully traces this to American popular Protestantism in the nineteenth century, the growing relationship between leisure and spirituality by the turn of the century, and the rise of conservative Protestantism as a response to liberal modernism by the second half of the twentieth century. Ultimately, Ketchell examines the perception by some of consumerism as a threat to the monochromatic vision long held in the area, and the ways local businesses are confronting whether to be Christian or more commercially successful.

Ketchell’s work is a pleasure to read not only because of the author’s ability to expose the roots of the topic, but also because of his ability to blend in his own ethnographic research. Using civil religion as an organizing principle, he describes an American nationalism overlain with conservative Protestantism wherein each justifies the other; being a good Christian makes one a good American, and being a good American makes one a good Christian.

Readers might be particularly interested in the ways in which Ketchell describes attitudes toward institutional expressions of religion versus a lived (Christian) spirituality that is an expression of the local general culture. American popular Protestantism is in full evidence here as Ketchell describes the very natural, personal, and sincere impulses among the people instrumental in the development of this area, as they work to bring their faith into action in their parks, entertainment, and crafts outlets.

If there is one critique, it is the absence of an in-depth exploration of the conflicts that such cultural and religious self-confidence engenders in marginalized parties. Much of the recent literature on American sacred space is built upon a “conflict” model, exploring the construction of the “sacred” not from a consensual center but on the conflicted boundaries. Ketchell hints at some of these conflicts—a discussion of unacceptable performers like Merle Haggard, Willie Nelson, and Johnny Cash; another of marginalized Catholics and the limits of ecumenism among the area churches—but he does not explore them as deeply as others might have. At the very least, virtual “throw-away” comments about the acceptance of patriotic Mormons like the Osmonds, juxtaposed with stories of the unofficial ban on the late John Denver (apparently for his habit of using profanity in his shows), merit closer investigation.

But this does not condemn the work. Ketchell has done a wonderful job presenting the history and ideology of sacred Branson and its connections to a conservative Christian
America that laments the passage of its own cultural monopoly even as it celebrates its faith. Ketchell’s work may be of greatest value as an example of one polarized vision of the “united” states.

Virginia Wesleyan College


In the last twenty years scholarship that addresses the contributions of women musicians (instrumentalists and vocalists) has increased readily. But a new book edited by Eileen Hayes and Linda Williams seeks to expand this discourse by focusing its gaze on black women’s music-making and the issues that arise out of the intersection of race and gender in popular and public culture. Black Women and Music: More than the Blues attempts to survey areas that have largely been excluded from previous scholarship on women in music and it does so strongly. Hayes states in her introductory essay that the book is a “corrective to discursive practices that inadvertently make invisible as much as illuminate the heterogeneity of black women’s musical experiences” (6-7). This text does this and more through an interdisciplinary approach that balances feminist and cultural theory with musicological analysis. The content of the text is divided into three main divisions with each addressing the issue of self-actualization as an artist, overcoming questions of authenticity within largely male milieux, the agency of “voice” and its relationship to the construction of dominant cultural and social themes and the black women’s construction of historical narratives within Western European music.

The first section of the book focuses primarily on the agency of power in the construction of alternative narratives of identity and authenticity in hip hop, blues and musical theater. Through an analysis of black love, Gwendolyn Pough’s essay discusses how the hip hop generation’s use of music as a conduit for understanding the issues of gender identity and male/female relationships even while creating overtly oppressive images such as “bitches” and “niggas”. Maria Johnson considers how female guitarists navigate the standards of beauty, femininity and authenticity while maintaining careers in the instrumental blues tradition. While Charles Nero situates how the black female gospel voice became the moniker for racial and cultural authenticity in musical theater first through the works of Langston Hughes and later through productions such as “Dreamgirls.”

The second section of the book concentrates on the contributions of black women in genres and musical circles where they have traditionally been non-existent. Deborah Pollard Smith chronicles the importance of Gospel announcer Edna Tatum in shaping the performance context of gospel performances through her sermonettes that preceded and followed gospel performances of James Cleveland. Linda Williams and Nanette De Jong explore the intersection of race and gender through the lives and experiences of women jazz instrumentalists. Eileen Hayes’ contribution on women’s music brings a much-needed discussion of black queer identity, while establishing the role of black female performers in the women’s music network.

Essays by Teresa Reed, Elizabeth Amelia Hadley and Sarah Schmalenberger, which concentrate primarily on the historic contributions of black women to our understanding of Western Art music, make up the final section. Thematically the book works well and provides the reader with strong contextual discussions that are supplemented with innovative and thought-provoking analysis. This book would be a strong addition to any course on popular music, women in music or cultural studies.

Miami University (Ohio)

Tammy L. Kernodle
Mark Gillem has produced a compelling study of the planning and execution of the American empire’s diasporic communities the sprawling military bases that have mushroomed in response to the imperial reach of the United States. The intrusive nature of these military outposts, tempered by the occasional fitful desire to address the concerns of the host society, are in Gillem’s mind, an incisive reflection of the more problematic aspects of the American empire. Much like the foreign policy that has engendered the presence of troops across the globe, the nation’s America towns are introspective re-creations of problematic American social and political arrangements. The America towns of his study are auto-focused, segregated and imperiously oblivious to local surroundings; they are dominated by franchises and banally standardized. A fundamental addiction to sprawl has been exacerbated in recent years by fears of terrorism. Buffer zones surround variations of these Green Zones, all of which vacillate between obliviousness and ignorance in their inevitable clash with host societies. Avoidance rather than interaction is the most salient quality of these domineering outposts.

Goodwin begins his study with a survey of empires past, implying that despite periodic nods toward American exceptionalism, the American empire is mostly a modern version of prior practices. Gillem judiciously shares the blames for the pathological aspects of these outposts. Ambitious politicians, officious military commanders, as well the pervasive economic entities that have accompanied America’s global reach in the civilian realm are all culpable in his mind. In fact, Gillem sees the malignant spread of such military outposts as a dialogue in which powerful forces in the host society willfully collaborate in the creation of these sprawling, wasteful enclaves. Occasionally there are erratic attempts to produce harmony with local mores and customs. But for the most part, America towns induce avoidance rather than interaction, extravagance rather than prudence. A variety of political and economic forces in host societies collude with, and profit off, these sprawling enclaves of America. Much like the dystopic exemplars of American suburbia, these military facsimiles have produced widespread environmental problems, crime, and blight, all of which are construed by host societies as affronts to local cultural mores. The sordid communities of camp followers that grow in the shadow of these outposts provide examples for some of the most troubling aspect of the uneven relationship between the military-suburban complex and its surroundings. It is here that power relations are expressed in a particularly unsavory gendered manner. Prostitution appears to be most the most sought-after commodity in the uneven exchange between host societies and American interlopers.

Goodwin’s study vacillates between an academic inquest and a journalistic expose’. Some might find this vacillation between different genres to be a weakness. I personally find it to be the major strength of his work as it supplies multiple angles for understanding the cultural and political impact of these outposts of the American empire.

New York University

Ron Robin

In *Cinema Babel*, University of Michigan Professor Mark Nornes (Dual appointment in the Department of Screen Arts and Cultures and the Department of Asian Languages and Cultures) provides a history of key cultural and ideological shifts that have influenced
media translation practices over the past century. Situating his approach between film studies and translation studies, a central theme of the book is the concept of global “traffic” which Nornes defines as being “qualitatively different than ‘movement’ or ‘circulation’ because it indicates regulation” (4). Nornes suggests that regulations in legislative forms such as tariffs, quotas, and censorship have dovetailed with a finely-tuned advanced system of production which privileges information and devalues other possible exchanges of meaning. Film translators, like those in other fields, are often presented as invisible and their role in the “violence” of translation is regularly obscured either actively or passively. In contradistinction to this commonsensical approach, Nornes argues a need for “abusive” translators, or who make their participation obvious in the production of meaning (25-27).

To this end, the book’s six chapters examine the various functions of film translation, its history, and several key debates such as the subtitling versus dubbing debate. The first two chapters discuss the various roles that film translators play in such specific sites as television, film coproductions, and international film festivals. Nornes relates how the translator on the multimillion dollar U.S./Japan coproduction of Tora Tora Tora! (1970) brokered his power successfully reinventing himself as a producer and even eclipsing the status of legendary director Kurosawa Akira. In the next two chapters, Nornes further examines the notion of translator as gatekeeper by providing an institutional history of the Benshi or film narrator. Arguing that the cinema was global in nature from the beginning, Nornes claims that “increase in [film] traffic was accompanied by—and sometimes in synergy with—the graduate elaboration of cinematic narrative” and that the Benshi’s role in integrating the new medium into established screen practice was an important transformation of the cinema (92-3). His discussion of the subtitling of early sound films in Japan highlights the fact that what translators chose not to translate was at least as affective to the overall emotional impact of a film as what was translated. Finally, Nornes problematizes the adoption of the two modes, subtitling versus dubbing, to resolve the problem of film translation by analyzing various ideological dimensions of both forms.

While theorizing on the role and function of translators is certainly not new as the author himself would admit, what is refreshing about Cinema Babel is the author’s careful placement of film translation within a framework that recognizes both historical and theoretical demands. Some may be put off by the author’s use of predominantly Japanese examples, but the argument here has a broad range of applications and makes an important contribution to the fields of film studies generally and Japan film studies in particular. University of Kansas

Michael Baskett

We Shall Overcome is a comprehensive history of Civil Rights and the Law in the United States from the revolutionary era to the present. The author focuses on how those who have been discriminated against used the law to gain justice and freedom. He also draws inferences concerning the continuing struggle for civil rights.

The book is a fine syntheses of the evolution of legal developments concerning Native Americans, sex equity, including discrimination based on sexual orientation, and discrimination based on national origin and language. However, most of the discussion concerns African Americans about whom Tsesis rejects the claim, of Michael Klarman and others, that Brown had little inspirational relevance to the subsequent civil rights movement.

The overall importance of the book depends on the persuasiveness of the author’s analysis and theory.

He believes that the persistent expansion of liberty and equality have been integral to American identity. The Constitution, through provisions such as the Equal Protection Clause, obligates the federal government to protect individual liberties as beneficial to the general welfare. The Constitution, contrary to Herbert Wechsler, John Ely and other “neutral principles” proponents, is not a procedural device concerned only with fairness in process but advances an obligation to produce substantive protection of fundamental and basic interests. Procedural consistency, neutral principles, or the preservation of democratic neutrality cannot justify the infringement of life, liberty, and property.

The author insists that rights in the Bill of Rights are not only incorporated through the 14th Amendment but through an expansive interpretation of unenumerated Constitutional protections. Sometimes as with the abolition of slavery, the protection of fundamental rights requires curbing individual liberty to promote the common good.

Because interpretation is permitted and required, each generation can reevaluate the treatment of the subordinated and what remedies to apply. Progressive interpretation results when coalitions gain popular support for the sake of national improvement and fairness.

Unlike Derrick Bell and Mary Dudziak, Tsesis believes that change comes, not because of interest convergence, but as a result of the actions of many committed people and organizations at great personal risk. He does not reckon with the need for some convergence, even if only to restore order, for the protestors to succeed.

Tsesis also disagrees with Roger Smith’s view of the mixed nature of American national purpose. He sees unalloyed liberal democracy as found in the Preamble to the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence as truly embodying the American creed. The Constitution was designed to enable the gradual shedding of prejudices in order to fulfill the creed.

Slavery, lynching, Indian Removal and Japanese internment, for example, were failures to live up to the creed and were distorted uses of the law. Accepting the creed is essential to Tsesis’ belief that law should be used to achieve social reform.

University of Pennsylvania

Mary Frances Berry


Hutson, manuscripts chief at the Library of Congress, is a leading authority on the religious culture of America at the era of Revolution and independence. In this work, part of the Cambridge Essential Histories series, he examines links between church and state and the meaning of religious liberty (or liberty of conscience) from English colonial settlement through the adoption of the first amendment to the Constitution.

His story challenges much popular understanding of “separation of church and state” that haunts twenty-first century public life and continues to provide legal cases that plague the judiciary from the local level to the Supreme Court. People still argue about what the proper relationship between government and religion and about what the founders
intended in the first amendment that forbade Congress from legally establishing religion or from restricting the “free exercise” of religion.

Hutson demonstrates that throughout the first two centuries of Euro-American life, there was no “wall of separation”—Jefferson’s phrase—between church and state. Political and religious leaders alike ascribed to the view found in Isaiah 43 that called rulers “nursing fathers” of religion. Indeed, Hutson shows, virtually all agreed that government had a keen interest in religion, in order to protect the people by assuring their eternal salvation and to preserve the political stability by minimizing religious disputes.

Yet government’s role was not to determine doctrine or practice. Here latitude could prevail, particularly after transitions in the mother country brought minimal toleration after the Glorious Revolution of 1688. Folks of that era differed from those of today, Hutson shows, in claiming that liberty of conscience could flourish even when there was taxation to support religion, particularly if that taxation were general assessments rather than support for one denomination.

In other words, government could favor religion—even favor one religion. But if all could worship as they chose without recrimination, liberty of conscience prevailed. This understanding is quite different from questioning whether posting the Ten Commandments in court rooms and classrooms creates a de facto religious establishment. The nation’s founders and religious leaders, even those adamant about assuring that government not interfere with worship and belief, would not appreciate today’s concerns. All agreed, Hutson emphasizes, that friendly aid and support for religion was necessary because religion molded a moral citizenry that in turn sustained democracy.

Hutson also argues persuasively that in most of the colonies, a far greater religious pluralism prevailed than the standard story allows. That fed into the design of the Constitution as a secular document, with no direct mention of God, and left its framers uncertain that the first amendment was really needed.

Hutson writes in a captivating fashion. His tale abounds with direct quotations that cry out for citation so others can locate the sources for them. Otherwise this work has extraordinary potential for student use.

University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
Charles H. Lippy, Emeritus

Filling a gap in extant scholarship, Charles L. Cohen and Paul S. Boyer’s edited volume is the first work to fully explore American religious history and print culture in the postbellum and modern periods. Cohen’s opening survey introduces the “brave new world of spiritual and textual multiplicity” (10) that this collection showcases. Boyer’s subsequent piece reflects the overall content of the volume with its contextualization and analysis of many genres of religious literature. Within this passing historical treatment, he foregrounds “the centrality of print materials in promoting, consolidating, defending, and sometimes attacking the cause of faith,” (15) an assertion that is thesis of the text.

Two themes in this vast collection are of particular interest. Essays in Part 1 and elsewhere deal broadly with religious responses to modernity. As James Emmett Ryan keenly demonstrates, Quakers have often been heralded in novels as exemplars of social ethics, yet their virtue has almost unanimously been deemed incompatible with dominant modes of modern ethical pragmatism in these same texts. Rennie B. Schoepflin explores works from medical missionaries written for Protestant children that offered familiar stereotypes of the non-Western “other” while seeking to validate the religious vantages
and modern healing approaches proffered by American missions. David J. Whittaker examines a turn-of-the-century shift in Mormon print culture that facilitated standardization and bureaucratization of the movement via handbooks that helped the Church revise its structures while still salvaging tradition. Two insightful essays on fundamentalist print culture also broach essential modern debates and issues such as evolutionary theory and female religious authority.

Part 5 analyzes popular print culture and consumerism, another key theme found throughout the collection. Examining the Religious Book Club in the 1920s, Erin A. Smith demonstrates that its titles helped to assuage seeming contradictions between faith and modern, rational life for liberal Protestant readers. Matthew S. Hedstrom skillfully brings together issues of print history, readership, and consumer culture in a piece that examines three 1940s best-sellers that laid the foundation for a later “spiritual but not religious” trend in American faith. In addition, Karyn Crowley offers an essay on New Age best-sellers and seeks to demonstrate how these works contain rhetorical strategies that assist women in navigating power relations despite critiques from feminists. Finally, Paul C. Gutjahr discusses the Bible-zine Revolve, a loose translation of the New Testament in the guise of a young woman’s magazine, while situating it within a larger tradition of “culturally relevant” Bibles aimed at niche markets.

The essays in this collection are impressively diverse and thereby reflect increasing religious pluralism during the period covered. One might expect to find the majority of pieces describing the relationship between bibliocentric Protestantism and print culture. While this subject does receive some coverage, the collection also includes interesting discussions of Judaism, new religious movements, and the New Age. Though an essay specifically focused on Catholicism is lacking, the preface confronts this shortcoming while suggesting courses of future scholarship. Although the book would profit from more coverage of post-1950s America, the importance of printed images, and the complicated relationship between writer message and reader reception, it is nevertheless replete with many deftly written, interdisciplinary essays that engage a much overlooked aspect of American history and culture.

University of Kansas
Aaron K. Ketchell


It seems very appropriate that Seattle, the city in which Jimi Hendrix was born, boasts an Experience Music Project and Science Fiction Museum. The Seattle Museum’s Experience Music Project Pop Conference is a unique annual event bringing together a wide range of academics, journalists, fanzine writers and similar enthusiasts to share their work on popular music. The EMP Conference is organized by Eric Weisbard, and in Listen Again he has collected and edited some of the best papers from recent EMP conferences. Perhaps because EMP events differs from typical academic conferences by featuring work from a very wide spectrum of authors—including journalists, poets, musicians, fanzine writers and assorted pop cultural practitioners and entrepreneurs—the papers featured in this volume are typically eclectic, eccentric and unorthodox while remaining highly readable and sometimes quite brilliant.

Charting musical experiences ranging from the ear-shattering monolithic Midwestern stadium rock of Grand Funk Railroad, to the refinement and middle class sophistication of ‘quiet storm’ soul, to a one-off ‘necrophiliac’ performance by a suicidal Dartmouth student in the early 1980s, the papers in Listen Again offer a refreshing alternative to the histori-
cal chronologies and cultural essentialism which characterize much academic writing on popular music. The emphasis here is instead upon Anglo-American pop’s enchanting ‘little narratives’, the non-sequiturs, unusual connections and heretical taxonomies which can combine to produce ‘magical’ interplay between music, identity and location.

Because they manage to bridge the gaps between the objectivity of academic research, the passions of ‘fandom’ and the hard realities of the production of pop culture, many of the papers in this volume succeed in delving into startlingly original territory. Outstanding examples include Marybeth Hamilton’s work on James McCune, an alcoholic obsessive record collector who invented the idea of a Delta Blues genre; Ned Sublette’s penetrating analysis of rise and fall of the influence of the cha-cha on American pop before and after the Cuban missile crisis; Cleveland punk rock pioneer David Thomas’ fascinating and amusing paper on the influence of Ghoulardi, a 1960’s late-night TV monster movie host, on the development of Cleveland’s alternative pop scene in subsequent decades, or Holly George-Warren’s tender and deeply engaging analysis of the mysterious career of country music icon Bobbie Gentry. The papers by Jason King on Roberta Flack and Mark Anthony Neal on the ‘White Chocolate Soul’ of Teena Marie and Lewis Taylor stand as definitive examples of the importance of flexible interpretation and anti-essentialism in popular cultural analysis.

Some more conventionally academic articles included in Listen Again are the work of a new generation of musicologists who challenge the fiercely policed traditional boundaries which have separated pop from ‘serious’ music within university music departments. Robert Fink’s paper on the complex relations between a dying European avant-garde modernist classical tradition, the seminal German electronic pop group Kraftwerk and the rise of hip-hop and techno charts the death of a high cultural musical canon and its contribution to the rise of new and vital musical formations via a collage of snippets, cross references and ironic reinterpretations.

As original as it is refreshing and engaging, Listen Again and, by implication, the work of the EMP Pop Conference, represents an important contribution to the serious consideration of pop music—essential reading in an era in which our experience and understanding of music is fragmenting, mixing and morphing at a bewildering pace.
for personal connection with authentic wilderness. Instead, he trained us to enjoy the extravagance of cyberspace’s Third Nature.” (24) Yet, despite such linkages, the book’s organization indicates a clear preference for direct rather than mediated encounters, and for the natural world rather than the built environment. The Internet cannot substitute for immersion in and personal observation of nature. The final and most interesting chapter (149-206) does not mention cyberspace, but is a fine essay on finding authenticity through intimate knowledge of the local. The central figures are Aldo Leopold and Annie Dillard, who exemplify Tuan’s topofilia. The three chapters in between review the search for authenticity through tourism (39-82), world’s fairs as utopian constructions (83-106), and “sleepwalking in America” (107-148) which reviews the culture of consumption and its relation to the ideology of manifest destiny. Each chapter is a useful overview that relies largely on secondary sources. The book as a whole is more suited to a reader new to these topics rather than to the specialist.

Opie scarcely cites the journal he once edited, *Environmental History*, nor does he mention such scholars as Hal Rothman and Martin Melosi, nor does he refer to Alan Trachtenberg or Miles Orvell in his discussions of photography. More crucially, Opie leaves out pastoralism and the American search for a middle landscape between the urban and the wild, perhaps because that tradition elides the division between first and second nature. Likewise, he mentions neither William Cronon or Richard White nor their questioning of “wilderness” as a category. In short, the concepts of first, second, third, and last nature must be more nuanced if they are to become the basis for research. However, this book can usefully guide students to think about how Americans have continually reconstructed their sense of place as they searched for an often problematic authenticity.

University of Southern Denmark

David E. Nye


Grusin interprets the coordination of cultural and technological forces in the creation of three national parks: Yosemite, Yellowstone, and Grand Canyon. In a brief conclusion, he considers three late-modern alternative parks: Cumberland Island National Seashore, which tries to recover the idea of wilderness prior to human intervention; Dinosaur National Monument as a prehistoric ecology; Robert Misrach’s *Bravo 20: The Bombing of the American West* (1990), a virtual counter-monument memorializing the military destruction of the West (complete with Visitor’s Center and Gift Shop). Grusin’s book ranges historically from post-Civil War to our postmodern era, although its primary focus is from the late 1860s (Yellowstone was established in 1872) to 1911, when the Grand Canyon was finally authorized as a national park. Grusin stresses the historical specificities of the imbrication of culture and technology, but also identifies the continuities between nineteenth-century ideologies of Nature and the West with our contemporary attitudes. Thus the problem with Misrach’s “anti-park” is not so much its political radicalism as its conventionality within the hermeneutic logics of modern U.S. efforts to appropriate the West for nationalist uses.

Grusin deploys a wide range of Continental theorists—Kant, Foucault, Derrida, Barthes, Zizek, and others—and visual studies theorists, like Rosalind Krauss and Jonathan Crary, to elevate his subject to the serious scholarly consideration it deserves. At times, these theories risk formalizing his objects of study. Yosemite recreates nature in textual...
terms, linking Olmsted and Muir with later semioticians. Yellowstone historicizes and narrativizes the West in ways resembling Derrida’s trace-structure of the sign. From John Wesley Powell’s first navigation of the Colorado River in 1869 to Lawrence Kasdan’s 1991 film, the Grand Canyon has figured ideologically as “cognitively inaccessible,” a sort of desert “differance.” Used heuristically, Grusin’s theoretical approaches enable us to understand the cultural uses of nature in the semiotics of the “national park system,” but those same theories do scholarly work analogous to the national ideology he criticizes.

Grusin explains clearly how the national park system contributed to the Myth of the Vanishing American, but he does little to acknowledge how native people have criticized these monuments. Consider the American Indian Movement’s Russell Means seizing the microphone at Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument during the 100th Anniversary of Custer’s Last Stand to protest the military-industrial conspiracy to colonize Indians, arguing that the National Monument is as obscene as a memorial to Lieutenant Calley would be at the village of My Lai in Vietnam (Edward Tabor Linenthal, Sacred Ground: Americans and Their Battlefields [Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991], 43-144). Similarly, Grusin’s focus on technology and science makes only passing references to the macro-economic forces behind such explorers, surveyors, and artists as Ferdinand Hayden, William Henry Jackson, Thomas Moran, John Wesley Powell, Clarence Dutton, and Jack Hillsers.

But these are minor objections to a brilliant study of media as diverse and difficult to interpret as: landscape painting, scientific surveys (including their maps, charts, and photography), nature writing, popular western literature, philosophical aesthetics, film, and the World Wide Web. Anyone who doubts the formal difficulty and historical complexity of cultural study should read this book, as should anyone who claims expertise in American Studies and American literature.

Abrams’s Landscape and Ideology in American Renaissance Literature promises a broader historical context for Grusin’s study of the national parks, but Abrams’s subtitle, Topographies of Skepticism, suggests that this book is not really about landscape or visuality, except as they mystify our textual senses. Canonical American Renaissance authors—Hawthorne, Thoreau, Melville—deconstruct the Myth of America, especially as it unfolds in Manifest Destiny. Whereas visual media—maps, paintings, iconography, scientific and ethnographic illustration—help shape the national body, Hawthorne, Thoreau, and Melville question the boundaries between Nature and Culture, destabilizing both. It is impossible to perceive either wilderness or civilization as distinct domains in “Young Goodman Brown,” A Week, and Pierre. The familiar deconstructive reading of these worthies elides the differences among them, so that Hawthorne’s conservative politics, Thoreau’s radical abolitionism, and Melville’s meliorism make very little difference for Abrams.

The reductiveness of his approach becomes even more troubling in his treatment of authors we now consider crucial for a broader understanding of nineteenth-century literary culture: Margaret Fuller, Chief Seattle, Frederick Douglass, and Rebecca Harding Davis. Fuller’s “disseminated free-play” (88) in Summer on the Lakes is incapable of doing anything in response to the ongoing genocide of Native Americans. Her critique of native primitivism as an effect of Euroamerican colonialism hardly makes her a friend of native peoples and cultures. Fuller’s condemnation of “half-breed” degeneracy contributes to the “tragic inevitability” of the Vanishing American, as does her advocacy of an institution like the Smithsonian where their cultural memory could be preserved. Noting these ideological contradictions in Fuller (all of which we also find in Hawthorne, Thoreau, and Melville), Abrams reaffirms Fuller’s minor status in the older literary canon. Ditto
for Chief Seattle, whose mid-nineteenth-century speech can never be recovered fully from its Euroamerican transcriptions and revisions, but when we do read between the lines we find hints of the more fully developed politics of difference best represented by Hawthorne, Thoreau, and Melville.

Even more troubling is Abrams’s interpretation of Douglass by way of the 1845 *Narrative* and later *My Bondage and My Freedom* (treated together with little attention paid to their historical and formal differences), in which Douglass is a citizen-subject caught between the slave’s inability to represent himself and the overdetermined myths of white subjectivity equated with the U.S. nation. Abrams is cautious about what he terms Douglass’s experience of the “enfeeblement” of the “mediating systems” (115) he must negotiate, but by relentlessly focusing on the slave’s social death Abrams ignores the rich culture African Americans developed in response to slavery. Wisely recognizing the relationship between working-class and racialized subjection stressed by Douglass and Du Bois, Abrams does relatively little with this insight in his reading of Davis’s “Life in the Iron Mills,” simply reverting to the indeterminacy of the “korl woman” Wolfe carves in aesthetic and political rebellion against capitalist oppression. Isn’t the “korl woman” racialized in the very material of her representation? And doesn’t her sculptural form, albeit appearing in a narrative, suggest possibilities of resistance in media other than literature?

Abrams’s argument fits neatly what I have criticized as liberal “aesthetic dissent” (Rowe, *At Emerson’s Tomb* [New York: Columbia University Press, 1997], 1). He concludes with a model for community based on the general idea of tolerating human and historical differences. We share an existential contingency that ought to encourage compassion and understanding of each other; the democratic social bond is thus fundamentally multicultural. Although I agree generally with this democratic ideal, I also think it neglects the very specific historical distinctions such a political theory requires. The abstractions of 1980s’ poststructuralists have been transformed by historicist, postcolonial, feminist, queer, and ethnic scholars into more nuanced cultural histories of U.S. nationalism. In addition, this nation can no longer be understood exclusively within its own ideological form, but as Anna Brickhouse has eloquently demonstrated must now take into account a transamerican literary renaissance, which is polyglot, transnational, multigeneric, and multi-mediated. Abrams does not sufficiently engage this broader hemispheric framework and relies on binaries—nature/culture, *écriture*/ocularocentrism, wilderness/civilization—too strictly drawn and abstractly framed.

University of Southern California

John Carlos Rowe

BAD FOR DEMOCRACY: How the Presidency Undermines the Power of the People.

Dana Nelson argues not against the president’s constitutional office but against “presidentialism,” a myth that defines the president as both guardian of democracy and leader of the nation. The myth was born in George Washington’s elaborate ceremonial events and nurtured by following presidents until it gained momentum in the twentieth century. Woodrow Wilson introduced the idea of the presidential mandate, whereby voting for president meant supporting all his policies. Franklin D. Roosevelt used emergency powers to enlarge national power. John F. Kennedy added public relations heroism and Ronald Reagan proclaimed the president as the embodiment of a great and good nation.

Nelson departs from her mythic framework to offer structural explanations for the growing authority of the presidency. The rise of political parties and the expansion of
the franchise reduced citizen influence on government because politicians asked only for a citizen’s vote and not their advice. The secret ballot reduced the influence of party pressure but allowed the president to ask directly for a “mandate.” Presidential use of war powers militarized politics and encouraged partisan struggles that undercut movements for social reform. Recently, presidents have asserted a “unitary executive,” under which the president controls all administrative agencies, including those intended by Congress to be independent. An extension of this power, first articulated by Richard Nixon, was that the president could commit no illegal act. The tools that implemented the unitary executive reduced local, citizen-based decision making. Free trade agreements have overturned local economic policies and practices. The result has created a culture of “rational choice theory” and free market capitalism that stresses individualism over collective, democratic action.

To recapture democracy, Nelson’s advocates “open systems” that invite large numbers to join and contribute. As models, she suggests internet “wikis,” the most notable example of which is Wikipedia, and “time banks,” where persons perform community service in exchange for “time dollars” that can be used to “buy” services from other community members. The key to the success of such systems is diversity: groups composed of different types will act more harmoniously and will make better decisions than groups of one type. She proceeds to consider various methods of putting this conception into operation.

Nelson draws upon the writings of political scientists, historians, economists and legal theorists to argue her case. Her use of these sources seems to be reasonable, although she provides no notes with specific citations.

This book usefully portrays the increase in presidential power. Still, it is hard to see that all assertions of presidential power have been anti-democratic. Many New Deal programs operated according to “grass roots democracy” and presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson enabled local groups fighting for civil rights. Nelson might also have considered such long-standing institutions as the New England town meeting and the League of Women Voters programs for civic improvement and consensus decision making. A consideration of these examples would have lent greater complexity and substance to her analysis.

Iowa State University
George McJimsey


Cathy Stanton won the 2007 National Council for Public History’s book prize for The Lowell Experiment, an empirically grounded study of public historians at work in a former Massachusetts textile mill town. The author situates the founding of Lowell National Historical Park (1978) in the context of the rise of public history and the emergence of the industrial heritage site out of the ruins of deindustrialization. She notes, rightly I think, that industrial museums “come to praise and to bury—to extol the workers whose labor created these places and frame that labor as something essentially finished.” (xii) The sense of disconnection with the present, its pastness, is an integral part to the interpretation of industrial sites. Stanton asserts that this unwillingness to tackle present-day issues serves to depoliticize the message, even when the Lowell site is infused with social history. Conflict is almost always located safely in the distant past.

Stanton uses the performance of the guided tour as an entry point into the Park Services’ interpretation of the site. The “The Run of the Mill” tour, the most frequently offered, consisted of a trolley and boat journey into the early development of the industrial
city. Technology, waterpower and the “mill girl” labour force all loomed large in the official narrative. However, Stanton is attentive to the small opportunities for subversion of the official line. Yet there was virtually no contact with residents during the park’s tour of the “Acre”, a poor working-class district, and a narrative arc of upward mobility. Throughout these chapters, Stanton makes the crucial point that the “culture-led regeneration” of Lowell has produced few new jobs. It was more a matter of re-imaging the town, branding it post-industrial.

The interpretative core of the book originates in Victor Turner’s notion of rituals of reconnection. Based on her interviews, Stanton concludes that working-class memories serve as markers of how far middle-class public historians and visitors have come. The park reconnects them with the working-class pasts of their parents or grandparents. In effect, “The park’s rituals of reconnection are designed to bridge personal distances—between visitors’ and public historians’ own family pasts and personal presents—while denying the social distances between these postindustrial workers and people less fortunately situated in the present day.” (182)

So far so good. Yet what perplexed me about Stanton’s book was its refusal to engage meaningfully with Martha Norkunas’ superb monograph, Monuments and Memory. Like Stanton, Norkunas examined the politics of remembering in post-industrial Lowell. But there the similarities end. For Stanton, the social actors are non-local public historians. In fact, local residents in Stanton’s account are peripheral to the story being told and their interventions are belittled as the work of a handful of “local cultural activists,” or as an “activist tribe.” (192) Stanton clearly questions their moral authority to speak on behalf of local community. By contrast, Norkunas is more interested in the public and private remembering of city residents including her own family. The two books thus mirror the two “poles of discourse” that prevail in Lowell: “localness” and “outsiderhood.”

The park’s “Working People” exhibition is put forward by Stanton as a warning to public historians who work with communities. The first half of the exhibit represents social history at its critical best. However, the second half of the exhibit on immigrants provides a celebratory narrative not unlike a scrapbook or photo album. The bifurcation of the exhibition was the result of a local representative playing the “blow-in card” to over-rule the objections of professional public historians. Stanton sides with her peers, throughout. Why is it that we only get to see the local “blow-in card” being played? What power cards did the institutional insiders in the National Park (the public historians) play? The unresolved tension between community collaboration and critical social history, so central to the work of Lowell’s progressive public historians, is thus plainly evident in Stanton’s book itself.

Concordia University (Quebec) Steven High


This book is about “camping” as a process of siting, clearing, making, and breaking a settlement. It is a philosophical inquiry into the meanings of place and time, specifically the process of moving, settling, creating, and changing as metaphors of human attachments to place and attempts to control change. This leads to the conclusion that camping is a method for thinking about place and home. The author draws extensively on cultural theory. Bachelard, Debord, de Certeau, Deleuze, Foucault, Lefebvre, Serres, and many others pop up like weeds (or rhizomes) in a campground and with much the same effect—they appear where they are not wanted. Does the reader really need a reference to
Foucault to explain the “double displacement” of Hurricane Katrina victims from their homes and from the Superdome to FEMA trailers?

Hailey, a practicing architect and assistant professor of architecture at the University of Florida, has some creative thoughts on the ways certain kinds of ephemeral settlements are shaped by people seeking to express themselves or merely hoping to survive. His book will appeal most to scholars with an interest in American popular culture, vernacular architecture, and city planning. His chapters on municipal auto camps in Florida and some of the permanent communities they spawned, such as Braden Castle Park and Gibsonton, a winter camp for carnival performers, offer fresh insights into this phase of the state’s history. His paring of Slab City, California, and the Burning Man festival in the desert north of Reno, Nevada, based on “similar climate and degree of remoteness” leads to a cursory but intriguing observation on virtual camping by Internet. A chapter on Manila Village, which existed in the Mississippi Delta south of New Orleans, from the 1870s to 1965, and the “urban camping” that followed the destruction of New Orleans by Hurricane Katrina, raises more questions than it answers.

How, for example, does the refugee camp, surely the most complex and ubiquitous example of campsite planning and administration in the world today, relate to the author’s concepts of duration and place? Hailey makes some good points about the relationship of military camps to other forms of semi-permanent settlements, and one of his principal insights, about the camp as a model for response to continuous change, is well argued. In the end, however, these points are lost in a fog of unfortunate rhetorical choices. Two examples of his prose will have to suffice: “The inclusion of ‘site’ in this work’s title is meant parenthetically and reflects not the complete suppression of site but the possibility of simultaneously maintaining and transforming sitedness through practices of siting, within the overall process of camping.” (5) “Remembering that Nietzsche wondered if there could be a grounding without ground, we might ask the following: does the confluence of a contemporary itinerancy of American dwelling (from permanent to temporary) and the incidence of camps that linger as dwelling sites (from temporary to permanent) suggest an alternative method for the construction of place—one that embraces the paradoxes inherent in architectures of mobility and time?” (223)

Although the title may suggest it, this book is not a history of camping, nor is it an examination of the material culture of camping apart from some references to trailer design and campground layouts. It is only obliquely about tourism or recreation. It has little to say about the physical environment of campsites except to note that they require space for campfires, tents, trailers, and other semi-permanent structures.

George Washington University, Emeritus  Bernard Mergen


In this latest addition to LSU Press’s Antislavery, Abolition, and the Atlantic World series, edited by R. J. M. Blackett and James Brewer Stewart, Alexander X. Byrd undertakes an ambitious project that plots the journeys traveled by black people, enslaved and free, back and forth across the Atlantic. Africans in chains moved from east to west ensnared by a horrific transoceanic traffic in human beings. More than eleven million souls arrived thus on the Atlantic’s western shores, at the cost of the lives of millions more, where most worked, lived and died, and their progeny too, as chattels within the pervasive systems of black slavery established throughout the Americas by European nations and peoples. The slave trade, of course, accounted for by far the largest movement of black
people and bondage in perpetuity was the lot of the vast majority, but some slaves did secure their freedom, and a few even crossed the ocean back to Africa.

Byrd selects one of the most significant of routes of the British slave trade, from the Bight of Biafra to Jamaica, to illustrate the experiences of enslaved African captives, while his depiction of free black voyagers follows them from London and Nova Scotia to Sierra Leone, and although acknowledging profound disparities in the scale, organization and motivation of these two migration streams he nevertheless sees connections. The latter was, of course, a consequence of and reaction to the former, but Byrd posits deeper social and cultural implications of movement and relocation as black people found their place and each other en route and in situ across the Atlantic world.

In a strong opening chapter, Byrd addresses indigenous cultural retention by enslaved Africans, positing that enslavement and transportation within Africa rather than homeland affinities shaped ethnic identification, a process that in the next chapter he sees further cemented during the “middle passage,” while chapters 3 and 4 consider the formation and articulation of African-Jamaican life and community under the duress of the island’s plantation economy. Byrd then turns his attention to the free black voyagers from London (chapters 5 and 6) and Nova Scotia (7, 8 and 9) and their arrival in Sierra Leone (10) where his stark depictions of the sea passage and the circumstances the participants faced after landing offer suggestive parallels to the slaves’ experiences, not just in terms of the onerous conditions, but also the corresponding effect of journey and settlement on the organization and aspirations of black life and community along the Atlantic seaboard.

The very different source materials Byrd employs in his analyses of the various sites on land and at sea do make for a somewhat uneven presentation, while his discussion of Jamaica would have benefited from the incorporation of island-based archival records, but his findings are insightful and suggestive. They offer fruitful directions for further study and real potential for advancing our understanding of the particular characteristics of a black Atlantic world experienced by peoples of Africa and its diaspora during the late eighteenth century.

Rider University

Roderick A. McDonald


In his recent synthesis of the Great Awakening, Thomas S. Kidd provides a densely-researched, panoramic account of the origins of evangelicalism in colonial British North America. Exploring the “long First Great Awakening” or the development and dissemination of an emotionally-intense, revival-centered evangelical style in the years between 1740 and 1783, Kidd’s work ranges from Nova Scotia to Georgia with a special emphasis on New England (xix). Arguing that emotional “outpourings of the Holy Spirit” defined evangelicalism and characterized the long First Great Awakening from earlier periods of religious revival, Kidd uses the cultural radicalism of the revivals—manifested by ecstatic emotionalism, itinerancy, unrestrained clerical rhetoric, and eventual congregational separation from ecclesiastical establishments—as a trope for understanding religious and cultural divisions within evangelicalism (xiv). Instead of prototypically pitting Old Lights against New Lights, Kidd’s work weaves a more nuanced tale of moderate evangelicals—those who approved of the evangelical New Birth but wished to restrain its more egalitarian and emotional excesses—and more radical evangelicals who welcomed the sweeping psychological and social changes unleashed by revivalism. Kidd’s work also mentions anti-revivalists such as Charles Chauncy and Alexander Garden, although
the true heart of the book rests in the innumerable clashes, compromises, and cleavages between radical and moderate evangelicals. What is most refreshing about Kidd’s work is that he paints both the development of evangelicalism and its concomitant splintering into radical and moderate factions on a geographically wide-ranging canvas. Initially charting the development of evangelical revivalism on a transatlantic scale, Kidd hones in on its dissemination throughout British North America. In boldly claiming all colonial America as his intellectual province, Kidd itinerates across the territory deftly weaving regional revivals into a cohesive narrative that emphasizes the geographic ubiquity of evangelical radicalism and the equally widespread commitment of evangelical moderates to contain the visions, signs, wonders, and leveling spirit unleashed by the revivals. In thematically connecting the stories of New England’s James Davenport, New Jersey’s Gilbert Tennent, South Carolina’s Hugh Bryan, Nova Scotia’s Henry Alline, the itinerating George Whitefield, and hosts of others in a period stretching nearly fifty years, Kidd’s narrative constructs a “long First Great Awakening” that continually oscillates between radical and moderate polarities and experiences “fits and starts” of emotional revivalism (323).

Importantly, Kidd argues that, despite their differences, moderate and radical evangelicals were united by a common culture of evangelicalism—a shared acceptance of the power of the Holy Spirit—that differed only in degree. And yet, given their major differences in polity and theology, one wonders if eighteenth-century Baptists, Congregationalists, and Shakers saw through their scruples to appreciate this common evangelical culture? Moreover, while Kidd’s study aims at an inclusive coverage of evangelical groups in the period, he says little about early Methodists and evangelical Anglicans. Nevertheless, in coherently charting the meteoric growth of North American evangelical groups in the years after 1740, Kidd’s synthesis is a welcome addition to studies of the Great Awakening.

Texas Woman’s University

Jacob M. Blosser


In this trim, compact volume Michael Olmert—known as much for his Emmy-award winning television programs as his popular books on museums—focuses his inquisitive mind on the lesser buildings constructed during the rise of English settlement in the greater Chesapeake region. While the book’s title calls out three distinctive building types emblematic of the eighteenth century, Olmert also targets laundries, dairies, offices, dovecotes, and icehouses. His focus on the minor structures that normally surrounded a property owner’s residence reinforces an observation made by a Yankee school marm who, during a later era, observed that a plantation seemed to have “as many roofs as rooms.” Various travelers noted with some regularity that a planter’s estate resembled a village or a little town. The collective visual impact of such an arrangement was the intended to mark a planter as a superior figure since any county would not have more than two or three truly impressive estates comprising more than a thousand acres. The most noteworthy plantations always included dozens of buildings; all of them usually subordinate to the planter’s house in position, scale, decoration, and finish. A substantial array of outbuildings adjoining a residence was a tangible sign of economic and social success readily accessible for all to see.

Olmert examines eight outbuilding types presenting them in a sequence that begins with buildings that stood close to the planter’s residence and moves progressively toward the margins of yard that surrounded his house. The kitchen is treated first and is followed
by discussions of laundries, smokehouses, dairies, privies, offices, dovecotes, and icehouses. Except for the office, all of these buildings enclose spaces designed for women’s work—though most often performed by enslaved African and African-American women. Playing the role of an investigative reporter, Olmert focuses mainly on the preservation strategies pursued at Colonial Williamsburg by such notable scholars Carl Lounsbury, Edward Chappell, Marley Brown, Willie Graham, Vanessa Patrick, and Joanne Bowen. His narrative pattern is generally to begin each chapter with an intriguing observation by an eighteenth-century commentator. Next he moves to descriptions of existing examples of a particular building type—say a smokehouse—and summarizes the findings of the current scholarship for that particular structure. Olmert then “yields the floor” to an expert in architectural history or archaeology and concludes his summary of their findings by adding his own fresh insights. On the matter of smokehouses, for example, he cites Chappell’s observation that house yards were divided into discrete zones for specific tasks demarcated as clean (dairy) and dirty (smokehouse). (87) Olmert responds with his own observation that wisdom during eighteenth century required a clear understanding of value hierarchies. In such a context, certain features like fence lines were crucial for establishing and maintaining civility and order. Olmert observes of colonial-era Virginians: “Their’s was world built on boundaries.” (89) By viewing eighteenth-century Virginia from the margins of its early dwelling sites, Olmert is able to engage the full landscape created by the colony’s founders. Playing upon the famous line of L.P. Hartley that “the past is a foreign country; they do things differently there,” Olmert suggests that there is much out there to be learned mainly by looking very carefully at what there is to see.

The George Washington University

John Michael Vlach


Using a geologic metaphor, Alan Houston mines Benjamin Franklin’s thought and actions, despite the scholar’s acknowledgement that Franklin was neither a systematic thinker nor a “footnoter” (30). This idiosyncratic founder remains on the margin of revolutionary political history because he does not fit neatly into the era’s major paradigms: he is not a classical republican; he is not a Lockean liberal; and his life cannot be explained by the Puritan concept of calling as famously argued by Max Weber. Franklin’s understanding of citizenship was not based on mortal fear, as Hobbes and Machiavelli would have it, nor was it determined by benevolence, as Hutchinson would argue, but on utility—on humans’ ability to assist each other. Houston emphasizes that this concept is much broader than mere economic rewards and includes anything that improves the quality of life for individuals and for groups, including friendship, knowledge, and freedom. Houston carefully distinguishes the politics of improvement from that of “progress,” which is often deterministic, ultra-rational, and exclusionary. Instead, improvement is “less a philosophical doctrine or a political program than a set of priorities applied in comparative and contextual judgments” (16). Houston usefully explains how the idea of utility connects many aspects of Franklin’s life and work, such as his pragmatic understanding of science, his accommodative approach to diplomacy, and his evolving opposition to slavery.

Although improvement advances interests, it is not natural or inevitable and therefore must be cultivated: it requires organization, negotiation, compromise, and sometimes a calculated measure of hypocrisy. For Franklin, commerce is the most productive model of social relations, and, because credit and debit drove trade in the American colonies,
self-improvement was critically important. Creating, sustaining, and performing a virtuous character depended, not on the presence of grace, but on developing and maintaining good habits. Given the complexity of commercial society, Franklin’s image of the self could no longer be simple, pure, and unitary, but was composite and frequently contradictory.

A fundamental moral imperative for Franklin was the joining of individuals into voluntary associations, and Houston uses Franklin’s own 1747 Association, a large privately-organized militia, to demonstrate how he believed that voluntary organizations should serve mutual interests and treat its members equally. They should not rely—as classical republicans would have it—on virtue but on well-designed rules and procedures. Franklin applied many such beliefs to government, and in particular to the British Empire, which, he believed, should be a commercially-driven union of free and equal states. When Britain began to emphasize its political superiority and to rule its colonies by fear, Franklin first sought to repair the connection, and then, when he understood these efforts would fail, to establish union within the colonies themselves.

Overall, Houston’s book does not produce a seismic shift in our understanding of Franklin, but he does connect his thoughts, words, and actions in a way that helpfully illuminates his fairly consistent approach to the world with which he interacted. Franklin’s Franklin is less acquisitive, less individualistic, less rational, more egalitarian, and more democratic than the Franklin we think we know, and for that reason Houston’s study is quite important.

Mount St. Mary’s University

Peter A. Dorsey


At the beginning of the new millennium 66% of the U.S. population owned homes and over 50% of population lived in suburbia. As the housing crisis unfolds at the end of the millennium’s first decade with massive mortgage defaulting in urban and suburban spaces, along with the increasing costs of automobile transportation, we have good reason to meditate on the concept of suburbia and its relationship to the American Dream. John Archer helps us do that. Spanning four centuries, Archer argues that suburban architecture and the idea of the American dream home are deeply rooted within seventeenth-century English philosophy and material culture. From John Locke to New Urbanism, Archer embraces, built, discursive, and lived spaces as he places the American dream home in a broader context.

Breaking the book into three major historical periods: eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries, the suburban house became the location in and from which a growing bourgeoisie explored the concept of identity. Domestic architecture becomes a powerful instrument to construct the self in multiple contexts, and the role of aesthetics forms a central element of identity in terms of class as well as the production of a national taste. Indeed, Archer’s aesthetic analysis should not be limited to his response to New Urban practitioners. We can also apply his work to analyze the reiterative articulation of suburban architectural, landscape architectural, and interior design tastes in television networks such as HGTV or the taste-maven corporation Martha Stewart Living Omimedia.

When surveying three centuries, the type of data accessible and useful to such a project changes dramatically. In Archer’s case, this results in a distinct bifurcation of the book. The first section focuses on interpreting architecture and landscape architecture using floor plans, maps, and photographs of elevations, while the later section utilizes romance novels, advertising, and film. Though his central theme does a reasonable job of
connecting the sections, the bifurcated feel might have been reduced if Archer had placed his theoretical framework (embracing Bakhtin and Bourdieu) at the beginning.

Having set himself the monumental task of articulating ideal suburban architecture Archer does miss some important elements. For example, a variety of British and American industrialists including Lever, Cadbury, Rowntree, and Pullman created aesthetically complex suburban communities for working class residents. These communities provided a nursery for suburban home architects and landscape architects of the City Beautiful and Garden City movements. However, Archer’s focus on the bourgeoisie limits his scope. Not only is there little mention of working class suburbs, there is scant mention of suburbs inhabited by ethnic, racial, and religious minorities, for example Latino, African-American, and Jewish communities. Questions this book raises include: how was identity constituted in minority suburbs, was it the same, did it differ, and why? I was surprised not to see mention of Kenneth Jackson’s masterful Crabgrass Frontier (1987) especially his reflections on nineteenth-century suburbs. Nor did Archer mention the single most powerful tool to expand U.S. twentieth-century suburban home growth and identify formation: the fixed rate 30 year mortgage. That said, Archer’s masterful and expansive work will interest a broad spectrum of scholars from architectural, cultural, planning, suburban, and urban studies, and is an important contribution to the study of suburbia in the United States.

Columbus State University  
Amanda Rees

FOR THE PEOPLE: American Populist Movements From The Revolution To The 1850s.  

The tumultuous first eighty years of the United States produced a varied procession of grass roots social mobilizations—from Shays’s Rebellion, to the Anti-Federalists, the Whiskey Rebellion, the Anti-Masons, New York’s Anti-Renters, Rhode Island’s Dorr war, and the Know-Nothings. In the usual treatment, such movements play multiple roles as historical losers, political outliers, flights of fantasy, radical utopians, dangerous reactionaries, and, more generally, speed bumps along the rushing advance of the American republic.

In a fine work of synthesis, Ronald Formisano puts these grass roots mobilizations at the center of political developments. It turns out, for example, that Daniel Shays’s band of protestors in western Massachusetts was but a small part of a much broader pattern of backwoods and extralegal movements that extended from the Carolinas to Vermont. As popular movements shifted to mainly electoral and political strategies in the first decades of the nineteenth century, these often non-party mobilizations made mass politics considerably more complex than the usual party binaries.

This is the first in a two volume work on nineteenth century social movements in which Formisano seeks to shed light on both left and right-leaning mobilizations that have emerged in recent years in the United States and Europe. He argues that the earlier movements followed a pattern of being simultaneously liberal and illiberal, progressive and reactionary. This argument is most effective when applied to the Anti-Masons—the subject of the book’s three most vital chapters. Taking Anti-Masonry seriously, Formisano offers especially keen insights about religion and gender. The result is a nuanced treatment of an influential movement that displayed tendencies that were at once egalitarian and authoritarian, democratic and intolerant.

Formisano demonstrates a masterful knowledge of the historical literature, and produces a compelling narrative. Part of his success is due to the way he fashions the concept populist. He explains that from the early nineteenth century what might be called
a populist rhetorical style became a mainstay of American political culture. But his interest is populist social movements, which he defines as originating in grass roots mobilizations that invoked the name of the people against the usurpations of political, economic, or other elites. Although representative government offered the promise of popular sovereignty, in its realization the promise was often deferred by the powerful. Populist movements, Formisano explains, emerged to bridge this gap between promise and reality.

Formisano cautions that his historical subjects “would not have recognized the terms ‘progressive’ or ‘reactionary’ much less have understood the ideological dichotomy that contemporary liberals and conservatives extrapolate from them.” (135) But in places he might have paid more heed to his own warning. His efforts to measure widely divergent historical phenomena across a reactionary-to-progressive spectrum can make for a confining pattern, a pattern that tends to understate the centrality of slavery. Similarly, he provides inadequate explanation for placing Free Soil and related movements of the “people” against the “Slave Power” outside of populist authenticity. These reservations aside, this is a wise, significant, and thought-provoking book that takes social movements out of the shadows and places them squarely in the middle of American politics.

California State University, Sacramento
Charles Postel


Even before I reached the stunning conclusion to Nicholas L. Syrett’s The Company He Keeps: A History of White College Fraternities, I had already found it to be one of the finest “masculinity histories” I had ever read. Although positioning itself within the recent historiography of American masculinity, the book deftly evades some of the pitfalls so often found in masculinity studies, particularly the tedious insistence on male anxiety (whether performance related or otherwise), or the repetitive claim that American men are always or have always been in some sort of crisis or another. The problem particularly with the latter thesis is that we have ended up with a raft of books which retell American history as men’s history, albeit an anxious one. In six substantive, chronologically ordered chapters, Syrett tells the story of how American men fashioned their identities within the fraternity systems that emerged within American colleges and universities between about 1820 and today. The larger story Syrett tells is how fraternities influenced, and were influenced by, trends in American higher education, and how the fraternity experience connected to larger cultural and historical movements (muscular Christianity) and events (the Civil War, World War II). Syrett deftly reads his archive in relation to the interactions of class, economics, social order, racial identity, religion and gender. From its beginnings in secretive obscurity and intellectual clubiness, the white, mostly Protestant, American fraternity experience has come to define not just one, but possibly the defining character of the American man at college. Antebellum fraternity brothers engaged in literary debate and encouraged intellectual ambition; “frat boys” in the post-World War II partied in the “Animal House” and pursued careers in date-rape and anti-gay bigotry. How on earth did this happen?

Syrett begins in the early antebellum period, with the establishment, in 1825, of a secret society at Union College in upstate New York. He suggest that, in this period, fraternities provided its members with bonds of loyalty and friendship in an age that was increasingly coming to value competition and rivalry as the key terms of American male identity. In this early period as well, the antagonistic relationship between a faculty charged with disciplining its students provided the occasion for fraternities to shelter its
members from hostile male authority, as well as to stage acts of rebellion against the institution itself. The theme of rebelliousness carries over into subsequent chapters as well. Indeed, if I have a criticism of the book as a whole, it is that Syrett does not consider the self-fashioned rebelliousness of American fraternity life in relation to the national myth America’s revolutionary personality. Chapter two describes the divergence of a secularized definition of manliness from the clerical or sacred manliness that had defined the earlier fraternal organizations and higher education ethos more generally. Fraternity men increasingly demanded that colleges and universities prepare them for lives outside of ministry; fraternities provided wealthier collegians an opportunity to define themselves apart from poorer and also pious classmates.

Chapter three details how fraternities went national over the course of the middle-years of the nineteenth century. “Membership in a national organization,” Syrett finds, created the “imagined fraternity” which in turn provided men from disparate regions and backgrounds the opportunity to define themselves as the natural leaders of the nation and embodiment of its best values. (118-119) The books next and possibly best chapter details the emergence of a recognizably modern fraternity man, one defined increasingly through class and economic advantage, athletic achievement, and “a properly enacted masculinity” (181) defined increasingly in terms of sexual achievement and white Protestant superiority. With the increasing numbers of American women pursuing higher education, the hitherto secondary role of sexual identity and performance becomes a strikingly visible feature of fraternal identity in the 20th century, arguably the measure of fraternal “success” in the 20th century. (228)

Chapter six and the book’s conclusion return us to a terrain familiar enough from movies and media reports of the last thirty years: death from alcohol poisoning; demeaning and life threatening hazing rituals; drunken brawls and property destruction; a misogynistic culture which rewards puerile attitudes toward women and implicitly sponsors sexual violence; and a vigilant anti-gay climate enforced—ironically some might say—through orientation tests, genital measurement, and other forms of homosocial behavior that indulge the very homoeroticism they would suppress. Although as social historian Syrett is deeply attentive to a regionally and generically diverse archive (personal correspondence, institutional records, memoirs, campus novels, and older histories), he is unafraid to make judicious use of cultural and sexuality theory to make sense of the historical material. This well written, carefully argued, and (in the conclusion) deftly polemical book is an excellent example of what modern historiography can achieve. It should be required reading for campus administrators, if not the parents of prospective fraternity members, and will in addition be of use to any American Studies scholar interested in gender, masculinity studies, social history, institutional history, literary and cultural studies.

University of Western Ontario (Canada) Bryce Traister


Professor of American Studies at Barnard College, William Chapman Sharpe is an art historian more than an historian of culture. Sharpe focuses on the meaning of the changes wrought in urban, high culture by the introduction of artificial lighting in the 1820s. Much as the book’s hero, the nineteen-century painter James Whistler, Sharpe is concerned, only in passing, with the impact of high art on the city and people of New York. For anyone interested in the art and writing of modern New York, however, Sharpe provides a rich, encompassing, and informed story.
Before gas lighting, darkness masked the night-time activities of cities. The night sheltered a wide-range of behavior censored by those who remained behind drawn curtains. The introduction of gas lighting made aspects of cities accessible and visible to everyone. The first chroniclers of this new, partially-lighted city acted as guides into the exotic and dangerous world that lurked in the shadows. By creating a semi-illuminated borderland, gas lighting broke down the radical division between day and night. James Whistler used this not-quite-night to create a new kind of painting, the nocturne, inspired by earlier musical nocturnes. Whistler’s abstract, night paintings of London and other cities visualized moods rather than delineated objects. His nocturnes transformed the tawdry, ugliness of London into tantalizing images of light and dark that obscured the day-time banality of modern cities. He also offered a new way to look at cities that set aside sensory perception in favor of aesthetic mood.

Sharpe charts the impact of subsequent advances in lighting that eliminated shadow and darkness and all illusion of an elegant and mysterious modernity. With modern, electrical lighting, the traditionally perceived differences between night and day disappeared. A tenement was a tenement. Darkness no longer hid the city’s crass materialism, brutality, and loneliness. By the 1950s, night time in New York, according to its artists, harbored no mysteries. Unaffected by sun or moon, the bland, beastly, and banal prowled the city night and day. Modern lighting made nocturnes, such as Whistler’s, unimaginable. For Sharpe, such a well-lighted city destroyed artists’ ability to sustain illusion. Sensory perception replaced imagination; facts replaced dreams.

Sharpe argues that, in the early nineteen century the discovery of the darkened city had helped shape the modern imagination. In the twentieth century, the all-illuminating light destroyed the modern imagination, leaving a post-modern, aesthetic confusion. This may well be true, but the lighting of the city also created a new city with infinitely more possibilities for its residents than Whistler’s moody, nocturnal world. As important as mood and aesthetics are, they are no substitute for life. Sharpe offers no suggestions on this score, still, for cultural historians of New York, New York Nocturne is a comfortable place to begin.

Kenyon College

William B. Scott


The latest of many studies of Spiritualism, Ghosts of Future Past joins several recent books on western Europe in challenging Max Weber’s identification of secularization as the basis of modernity. A distinctly modern enterprise in its insistence on scientific grounding and incorporation of such technological innovations as telegraphy and photography, nineteenth-century Spiritualism reveals to McGarry “a narrative in which secularism does not simply or inevitable triumph over an antimodern, atavistic religion” (5) and in which religion functions as a viable basis for political engagement.

In McGarry’s cultural history, Spiritualist mediums, “reimagining the corporeal” (49), practiced acts of embodiment or “haunting” that “unsettled immutable binaries” (46) between past and present, male and female, white and Indian, public and private. They gave palpable presence to the racially, sexually, geographically, and chronologically other, freeing themselves from the limitations of the past and the sexualized body and assuming sexually transgressive postures and radical political positions. While the middle-class cult of mourning distanced the dead, Spiritualists drew them near and, forging in their press a “community in print” (21), channeled collective mourning into a “national conver-
tion” about radical reform (49). While their white contemporaries imagined Indians as vanished, or distanced in time and space, Spiritualists evoked militantly “(un)vanished” Indians (73) and supported their rights. Anthony Comstock’s censorship campaign and antipathy for flamboyant feminist and Spiritualist Victoria Woodhull, McGarry argues, were driven not only by her titillating coverage of the Beecher-Tilden affair in Woodhull and Claflin’s Weekly but by the fact that the materialization of spirits in the séance room, like the movement of pornographic material through the U.S. mail, threatened the boundary between the pure, “private” middle-class home and the morally tainted “public” sphere. Meanwhile, male mediums assuming female voices and vice versa broached subversive sexual identities, subverting the familiar Victorian male-female binary and—the secular focus of Michel Foucault’s History of Sexuality notwithstanding—pointing to religious sources for the modern discourse of scientific sexology.

Breaking new ground and crackling with new insights, McGarry offers an important addition to the literature. But her engagement with existing scholarship is limited. Her eye for Spiritualism’s political radicalism and sexual subversion lead her to engage Ann Braude’s Radical Spirits (1989), which ties Spiritualism to radical feminism, and Robert S. Cox’s Body and Soul (2003), which emphasizes Spiritualism’s racially conservative impulses. But her analyses of male mediums and the reformatory functions of Spiritualist mourning fail to engage recent work on those topics. Nor does she entirely succeed in her larger historiographic goals; indeed, she bolsters some of the traditional paradigms she seeks to displace. Despite over two decades of challenges to the mainstream-fringe binary in studies of American religion, McGarry weakens her case for Spiritualism’s relevance after the Civil War by using it uncritically and repeatedly underscoring Spiritualism’s marginalization. Thus by the 1870s Spiritualists ceased to occupy the center of women’s rights movement (65), and their support for Indians constituted a “lone voice” (88). Likewise, acknowledging an uncomfortable “cultural fit between mainstream America and Spiritualism” (64) after the war undermines her challenge to the longstanding narrative of a midcentury shift from reform to retreat.

Such issues are not unusual in books as intellectually adventurous as McGarry’s. Perhaps her jargony prose is similarly symptomatic. But readers who dive in will be richly rewarded.

California State University Stanislaus

Bret E. Carroll


Dangerous to Know introduces two infamous women of early nineteenth-century Philadelphia. Ann Carson was charged as an accessory after her lover murdered her husband; she was tried for conspiring to kidnap the governor of Pennsylvania in an attempt to break her lover out of jail; she was arrested for bigamy; and she eventually found herself in court again for passing counterfeit bank notes. Carson died in prison in 1824, the victim, according to rumors, of a fellow prisoner who had purposefully exposed her to typhus. Mary Clarke met Carson when Carson hired her to ghostwrite The History of the Celebrated Mrs. Ann Carson (1822). As Branson tells it, the History weaves together the titillating details of Carson’s romantic affairs, argues for female empowerment, and strives to justify Carson’s middle-class position, despite her many ostensible violations of that class’s norms. Clarke also wrote, years after Carson’s death, The Memoirs of the Celebrated and Beautiful Mrs. Ann Carson (1838), a sensationalistic exposé of Carson’s
betrayals of those who tried to help her, as well as her persistent association with criminals.

What is notable about the stories of Carson and Clarke is that both women were born to respectable, middle-class families, and Branson begins her book by chronicling the personal failures, bad luck, and economic upheavals that led to their decline in fortune. Both women married men who failed to support them, and so they set out to support themselves—Carson through running a china shop, Clarke through editing and publishing a magazine and then through writing her own books. Although both women sought to retain their middle-class status, once having stepped away from conventional roles, they seemed almost inevitably to descend into a rather shadowy moral world. (Even Clarke spent time in jail—running her magazine from debtor’s prison, a fact she carefully concealed from her readers.) Branson’s expert account shows that Carson’s and Clarke’s lives were directed by a combination of necessity and choice: both women were driven by poverty and constrained by gender roles, yet they made choices and were “self-aware of their situation as women.” (138) Perhaps the most important intervention that Branson makes with this history is articulated in her claim that “more alternatives . . . were available for women than our knowledge derived from conduct books, sermons, and other sources have led us to believe.” (138) Less explicitly, though, Branson also discloses the incredible cost to women of deviating from the plan for women’s lives laid out in those same “conduct books [and] sermons.” In fact, Ann Carson’s life, in particular, can be seen as a veritable moral warning to those women who did transgress the clearly incredibly powerful middle-class ideology. Having set herself up as the owner of her own business, Carson then found herself involved in adultery, bigamy, murder, kidnapping, and counterfeiting. She died in prison. Not happy consequences of the pursuit of independence.

Lehigh University

Dawn Keetley


In six compelling chapters evenly distributed across two sections, Michael A. Chaney delivers a “smart” interdisciplinary study focusing on African American productions—books, crafts, panoramas, and illustrations—of visual fugitivity. “Whether through citation to an unexpected portrait, appropriation of traditional visual technologies, or proximity to illustration, the intertexts of Fugitive Vision,” writes Chaney, “require a critical sensibility open to an aesthetics based on experiences of oppression that challenge a hermeneutics of accessibility, rationality, and correspondence.”(211) The introduction, “Look Beyond and Through the Fugitive Icon,” solicits deconstruction of popular advertisements showing absconders carrying bundles of necessities across their shoulders.

Willing readers envision what the well-known Frederick Douglass, William Craft, Ellen Craft, Henry Bibb, William Wells Brown, and Harriet Jacobs alongside the less-well known Dave, a South Carolina potter, saw or thought as freedom seekers. Such an alternative mapping of historical interstices and intertextual spaces leads to revisioning, hybridity, and competing interpretations. To advance that agenda, Fugitive Visions employs the social and historical construction of race and gender along with literature, art history, film criticism, and psychoanalytical theories.

The fugitives shared the commonalities of slave birth and resentment of the same, yet their insurgencies varied widely. They appropriated commonly accepted visual and
verbal representations and refashioned them. Frederick Douglass, for example, refers to a drawing of Ramses when describing his own mother. Significantly, Chaney writes:

Douglass may have chosen an illustration so unlike a nineteenth-century reader’s image of an enslaved woman in order to critique white preconceptions of blackness to alter and destroy the colonial gaze, to register his refusal to internalize racializing depictions of blackness, and to supplant the colonizing gaze that only sees blackness with his own alternative of seeing, a form of black looking that sees mental endowment, nobility, and heritage without the stigma of color. (46)

Chaney’s analyses of the Crafts’ wardrobes for freedom flights and Harriet Jacobs’ hiding place hoax, like Douglass’s Ramses, reflect the imagination and creativity of unlimited minds within bound bodies.

In a similar vein, Chaney unveils the sophisticated thought behind William Wells Brown’s 1850 *Original Panoramic Views of Slavery*. Brown’s technical production shifts the gaze from the peaceful splendor of the slaveholders’ idyllic Mississippi Valley to heart-wrenching scenes in the lives of enslaved men, women, and their children. Brown’s introduction of a material object, the iron collar, prods viewers to question the heights and depths of American civilization.

Finally, chapter six, “Throwing Identity in the Poetry-Pottery of Dave the Potter,” chronicles fugitivity through “contraband inscriptions” on clay pots. In florid phrases or terse verses, Dave resists dehumanization and commodification. Seemingly nonplused, he writes, “I wonder where is all my relations” on one side of a pot. When spun around, viewers see “Friendship to all and every nation” on the opposite side. Dave notes that his people are scattered throughout the diaspora where they may or may not be visible but are remembered.

Dave’s craft, literacy, and individuality replete with wit and guile, liberated him from many of slavery’s boundaries. In that sense, he was estranged from a system that seems applicable to him in name only. Therefore, the nom de plume, “Dave, the Potter,” is more appropriate and meaningful than “Dave, the Slave.”

*Fugitive Vision*, an important and well-researched study, differs from Nell Irving Painter’s thoughtful treatment of the *cartes-de visite* in *Sojourner Truth* by interrogating a greater variety of verbal and visual productions by rebellious blacks. And, in the process, Michael A. Chaney makes a distinct contribution to the literature about slave-born men and women who were dedicated to the permanent liberation of minds and bodies.

University of Missouri
Wilma King


The history of psychiatry, insane asylums, and mental illnesses has been a growth industry since the 1960s. Historians, social scientists, social and literary critics, and others have engaged in debates over the character of the specialty, the institutions with which it has been associated, and the nature of mental illnesses. On the one side are those who insist that an understanding of these subjects can shed light on far larger social, economic, political, and intellectual themes. In their eyes the psychiatry and the asylum are surrogates for the rise of industrial capitalism and a means of standardizing human behavior and enforcing certain social norms. On the other side are those who maintain
that the specialty and its institutions deal with disorders that admittedly have an unclear pathology and present formidable barriers to effective care and treatment. Debates between and among these two competing approaches have often taken place in a contentious and heated atmosphere.

In *Theaters of Madness* Benjamin Reiss has written a provocative book that clearly falls into the first camp. A scholar of literature, he analyzes the writings of prominent nineteenth-century literary figures as well as patients in an effort to delineate not only the character of asylums and psychiatric thought, but the very nature of American society. That he has been influenced by such figures as Michel Foucault, Erving Goffman, and David Rothman is clear even though he does not accept their interpretations without reservations.

The treatment of the insane in the mid-nineteenth century, according to Reiss, “was a central topic in cultural conversations about democracy, freedom, and modernity” (x). In chapters that cover such diverse topics as the writings of patients, the use of blackface minstrelsy within the asylum, the constant referral to Shakespearean psychology to validate the system of moral and medical treatment, and an analysis of such literary luminaries as Emerson and Poe, he attempts to justify this claim. Culture was deployed as a tool to reinforce social norms and standardize human behavior.

That *Theaters of Madness* will appeal to those in cultural and literary studies is clear, if only because it presents a critique of mid-nineteenth-century American society. To those like myself who are situated in the history of medicine, however, the book has numerous shortcomings. The use of literary sources, for example, tells us little about the reality of institutional care and treatment. The assertion that individuals confined in asylums in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries included “the maladjusted, the drunken, the visionary, the drug-addled, the brain-damaged, the promiscuous, the self-polluting, the lazy, the depressed, the raving, and the violent” (123) is at best a caricature and almost assumes that mental illnesses do not exist. To be sure, our knowledge of the etiology and pathology of mental disorders—like that of many other diseases—are fragmentary and incomplete. But this does not mean that such diagnostic categories are meaningless. The critique of asylums, moreover, ignores the fact that they provided sustenance to a dependent population for whom means of survival were tenuous. While claims of curability were overstated, there is evidence that many persons benefitted from asylum care. This is not to argue that asylums were without major shortcomings; it is merely to suggest that like most human institutions, they combined virtues and faults. *Theaters of Madness* in many ways reveals the chasm between historians of medicine and scholars in cultural and literary studies.

Rutgers University, New Brunswick
Gerald N. Grob


“Yes, but what’s in it for American Studies?” In the years after I founded this journal in 1959 that was the basic question to contributors and reviewers working in traditional fields or with books that seemed more disciplinary than interdisciplinary. The answer in the case of this boxed two-volume set is easy: explain the concerns of any American citizen and you open a window on the age. If the citizen is as deeply involved in the contemporary culture as was “poor Eddie” (as he sometimes called himself), there is a lot to see outside that window.
As Pollin, Savoye and their predecessors frankly note (the editors reprint introductory essays from the earlier editions of Poe’s letters), you’re not likely to gain great new insights into Poe’s puzzling psyche, though all the whining, begging, toadying and scheming are revealing, I suppose. But Poe’s personality—this is a terrible confession—bores me. It’s the world in which he tries to operate that’s furiously fascinating. The mass media already existed, and Poe was a media artist, reacting to the recent rapid spread of literacy, the impact of women’s tastes, the “invention of the lady,” the advent of instantaneous communication, explosive economic and social instability, political turmoil, the popularization of intellectual tendencies like Transcendentalism. Material culture, too, including diet: I love Poe’s gleeful rundown (in Letter 174) of his first breakfast at the New York boarding-house where he located digs: slabs of heavy grub, full tummies for Edgar and Virginia, and hearty fare for scholars hungry for the stuff of American life. The turbulent society that would produce Joseph Smith and Battle Creek, phalansteries and John Brown is the world in which Poe operated.

Having just edited Poe’s prospectuses for the magazine he wanted to found, I saw how close to those documents in language were his letters to Washington Irving (June 21, 1841) and to other prominent U.S. writers—though as always in Poe, each revision shows new turns of thought and even contradictions, duly noted by the editors. Poe’s implied assessment of the structure of the national reading audience should interest Americanists. Literature scholars mistake the magazines that Poe edited and for which he wrote for literary journals in the modern sense. They weren’t; most were closer to the popular general magazines that geezers of my generation grew up with: alongside literary material, they ran pieces (and illustrations) on fashions; they printed celebrity gossip, popular music, puzzles—all manner of content aimed at the new readers.

Collected Letters is careful, comprehensive, and conscientiously constructed. Here are not only letters we’re sure Poe wrote, but “Fakes, Forgeries, and Spurious Letters,” detailed discussions of folks with whom his correspondence is considerable, even a revealing appendix of “Promissory Notes and Receipts.” Each item comes with information on its source and satisfying explanations of all the editors can figure out of its significance. Many of their discoveries provide jumping-off places for Americanists who want to stroll the streets Poe walked, learning how one mailed documents, used new technology (an anastatic letter actually has some advantages over an e-mail), paid bills, went bankrupt.

The story of the project to produce a complete and carefully annotated Poe “Works” is too complicated to tell here. What began with the scholarship of Thomas Ollive Mabbott through Harvard University Press has now bifurcated; at present part is published by Jordan Press, part by University of Illinois Press, and some parts overlap. But care and thoroughness have remained at high levels; the scholar-editors involved cooperate rather than compete. Started before “Center for Editions of American Authors” guidelines were established, a definitive Poe edition really couldn’t have followed them anyhow, for Poe requires much heavier explication and more textural variants than the guidelines allow. Often there is no “standard text” to be had. That’s part of the story, and part of the reason Poe is so good as American Studies material—he was up to his armpits in journalistic politicizing, doing things a work-stressed popular writer (as opposed, say, to an author with a day-job as professor, or with connections to wealth) had to do. So Poe recycled, re-edited, continually rebuilt his work. Letters, reviews, essays, editorial blurbs, fiction and poetry all repeat with variations, and interconnect. In showing this, a good edition such as the one under review shows the world of the 1830s and 40s, and how a struggling media artist worked in it.
Blending the scattered scholarship of John Ward Ostrom and others with very extensive new material in a consistent, chronologically orderly format, with elaborate and meticulous apparatus—Pollin and his colleague explicate, index and cross-reference like crazy—this edition is, to mix metaphors, both easy to navigate and a treasure-trove for Americanists.

University of Kansas


The past decade or so has seen an outpouring of books particularly from literary scholars on the subject of death, grief and mourning. This efflorescence of scholarship might be yet another post 9/11 phenomenon—a need to understand what happens to a culture when time becomes reckoned by a different pace and measure. Or it may be in the time honoured tradition of revisionism that scholars noted lacunae in the thinking about these topics. Whatever the reason, a rich literature now exists that struggles with the meaning of grief and mourning in nineteenth-century America.

Dana Luciano’s Arranging Grief: Sacred Time and the Body in Nineteenth-Century America joins books such as Russ Castronovo’s Necro—citizenship: Death, Eroticism, and the Public Sphere in the Nineteenth Century United States and Mary Louise Kete’s Sentimental Collaborations: Mourning and Middle-class Identity in Nineteenth Century America in exploring the meaning, indeed the centrality of mourning to white, middle class American culture. Linking her concerns—time, specifically sacred time, and the body—to grief and mourning Luciano contends that grief is a response “...to anxiety over the new shape of time by insisting that emotional attachment had its own pace...” Grief could not halt the quickened march of modern time but could resist it. In light of this argument, she provides fresh readings of giant names in antebellum literature such as Cooper, Emerson, Whitman, Sedgwick, Douglass as well as examining mourning manuals, sermons and memorial tracts.

Importantly, Luciano takes on Philippe Ariès, long seen as the founder of thanatohistory. Ariès contends that Western culture’s nineteenth-century cult of mourning preceded the denial of death in the twentieth century. By contrast, Luciano claims that rather than being the penultimate stage of the cultural erasure of death, nineteenth-century mourning effectively wiped out all forms of bereavement other than the Anglo-American. She challenges the notion, rooted in Ariès, that nineteenth-century mourning is no more than a “mere moment(s) in a larger history of decline” but instead draws attention to the “profound productivity of mourning.”

She illustrates this “productivity” by arguing for the national and political importance of mourning following Lincoln’s death. In a chapter that takes as its theoretical underpinning Benedict Anderson’s Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism, Luciano shows that the flood of Lincoln eulogies, in addition to using grief to bind the nation together, also highlighted Lincoln’s “capacity for feeling” and identified him in essence as the “mother” of the reunited nation. A key part of this chapter is Luciano’s reading of ex-slave seamstress Elizabeth Keckley’s 1868 White House memoir which, she claims, demonstrates that “black grief over the assassination” was “both a mode of affirmative national belonging and a form of affective labor that could allow African Americans to move forward in national time.”

I offer one criticism of what overall I believe to be a brilliant and original literary-historical study. While Foucault, Deluze, Anderson and other post-modern theorists
illuminates Luciano’s book, her reliance on theoretical jargon limits the readership of this important work. Luciano writes well and argues persuasively. Why obscure rather than enhance meaning?

University of Kansas

Ann Schofield


They came from many regions of the United States, boys and girls, bringing with them their own civilizations. American Indian children came from numerous tribes that had their own languages, laws, literatures, religions, families, music, dances, educational systems, and philosophies of life and death. But many non-Indian reformers believed they knew what was best of these children: to assimilate them into the dominant culture of the nation and transform them into the mainstream. Their method proved to be a segregated educational system that tore children from their cultures, parents, grandparents, and communities. During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, American officials brought Indian students to their schools to destroy aspects of Native American culture and supplant it with white civilization that included a large dose of Christianity. Some non-Indians argued that forced assimilation was crucial to Native American survival, while others wanted Indian students to become “useful” laborers. Indian schools became the mechanism by which white reformers could effectuate cultural genocide and assimilation. This is the subject of Fear-Segal’s scholarly study.

Reformers used the white man’s club to transform Indian children, and Fear-Segal uses the statement as a starting point for her unique and insightful volume. She approaches the book topically fashion, using multiple fields of research, sources, and methodologies to examine the influence of race in the creation and execution of Indian schools, particularly off-reservation boarding schools. Fear-Segal draws on historical theories about race, power, and social control to begin her book but does not belabor these keen points at the expense of in-depth content and her own astute analysis. Fear-Segal knows her topic well and she invites readers into the Carlisle Indian Industrial School, Dakota Mission, Santee Normal Training School, and other similar institutions to illuminate issues of race. She demonstrates the origin and continuance of the assault on Indian civilization by focusing on the educational philosophies and consequences of key individuals, including Richard Henry Pratt, Samuel Chapman Armstrong, Stephen Riggs, Marianna Burgess, and others. Her use of biography and autobiographies of Indians and non-Indians alike is a strong contribution of the book, and her careful reading of these sources provides a fresh look at familiar participants in the Indian school system. Fear-Segal compares and contrasts the educational philosophies and approaches of Hampton Institute, Carlisle Industrial School, and the Santee Normal Training School, and her use of comparisons throughout the volume enriches the study and contributes to our understanding of complex educational systems forced on many Indians.

The author does not make victims of Indians but uses examples of individual Indian students like Thomas Wildcat Alford, Zitkala-sa, Charles Eastman, Kesetta Roosevelt, Jack Mather, Susie Rayos Marmo, and others central to the book. Fear-Segal offers wonderful examples of how selected American Indian students acted and reacted to their situation, and, in some cases, how they survived after their boarding school days. She makes clear that all of the students, whether they are known well or not, had a tremendous impact on American history and culture through their participation in the schools. The families of former students know the stories of their kin very well, and they continue to
have personal knowledge, memories, and interpretations that influence the development of new literature on the history of Indian schools. Fear-Segal draws on Native American knowledge in framing her work. She provides a moving chapter on the student cemetery at Carlisle and its long-term meaning to Indians and non-Indians alike. Fear-Segal has brought together numerous topics central to the Indian school experience in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, including race, gender, assimilation, education, and power. She concludes her outstanding study with an analysis of the inter-tribal pow wow at Carlisle in 2000, held on the grounds of the former Indian school. The pow wow brought together Native Americans from many regions of the country, including Alaska, where relatives of former students celebrated the lives of their loved ones, mourned the loss of too many children, and danced, drummed, and sang on the school grounds established by Captain Pratt to “Kill the Indian in him and save the man.”

University of California Riverside


John T. Cumbler examines a small core of New England abolitionists’ radical efforts on behalf of antislavery and other reforms before and after the Civil War. He uses the biographies of two key figures, Henry Ingersoll Bowditch and Julia Ward Howe, to anchor his narrative. He incorporates other (largely famous) abolitionists, from Wendell Phillips to Thomas Wentworth Higginson, to explore the Boston reform community from which Bowditch and Howe emerged and in which they continued to operate after 1865.

Cumbler scrutinizes the development of Bowditch’s antislavery beliefs, which he argues stemmed from his belief in Lockean natural rights. Moreover, he explains, Bowditch and his fellow abolitionists believed that government should act on behalf of common people to safeguard these rights. Though they squabbled and even had serious falling-outs about how best to enact equality, Cumbler highlights how abolitionists operated as a tight-knit community in the face of widespread hostility. His narrative of how Howe moved from unhappiness within her marriage into engagement with and leadership within the Boston abolitionist community is compelling and is set up as emblematic of how many experienced conversion to the cause. However, disappointingly little attention is paid to the Howes’ involvement with John Brown, particularly in light of Cumbler’s argument that the 1850s emphasis on “increasingly male” (83) militancy left women out.

After the Civil War, Cumbler argues that Bowditch, Howe, Phillips, and other Boston abolitionists did more than just celebrate their achievement. Instead, he writes, they vowed to continue on “till every yoke is broken.” (1) Bowditch, for instance, worked for women’s admittance to the Massachusetts Medical Society and, later, the AMA. He and other “old abolitionist-alumni” (123) saw such advocacy, as well as their work for woman suffrage, tenement reform, and public health on the same terms as their prewar efforts. Cumbler does a good job of demonstrating how Bowditch and Phillips looked to an activist government to safeguard human rights. It is unclear how many abolitionists thought this way in Boston and beyond, but he makes the case that the belief was important nonetheless.

In their hopes that the government would secure rights for all, Bowditch and others were doomed to disappointment. Cumbler chronicles the postwar demise of radical reform. The hopeful early years of Reconstruction yielded to the ugliness of Jim Crow, Social Darwinism resulted in decreased empathy towards poor and immigrants, and the
remnant who had taken part in the heady days of antislavery dwindled. Wendell Phillips was booed for his protest against lynching in the same Boston gathering spot where an audience had once cheered his antislavery stance. By the time of Howe’s death in 1910, Cumbler argues, reformers had retrenched to a much more limited Progressive agenda.

Cumbler covers a lot of ground in this compact volume, and on occasions the reader wants more, especially on abolitionists’ beliefs about and commitment to African American equality. But due to his chronological scope and his argument about abolitionist perceptions of an activist government, this is a thought-provoking work that should interest historians and many others.

Appalachian State University

Bonnie Laughlin-Schultz

SENECA FALLS AND THE ORIGINS OF THE WOMEN’S RIGHTS MOVEMENT.


As part of Oxford’s prestigious Pivotal Moments in American History series, on the surface, McMillen’s task would seem fairly straightforward: what was it about the Seneca Falls Convention in 1848 that made it a defining moment in United States history? McMillen takes this question to task early in her work, arguing that the Seneca Falls Convention “changed the way American society . . . thought about and treated women in the mid-nineteenth century,” noting further that the Convention “unleashed” the struggle for women’s equality that continues into the twenty-first century (3).

Ignoring the growing body of recent scholarship that challenges this thesis, McMillen’s narrative focuses on four aptly-chosen leaders of the nineteenth century women’s rights movement: Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony and Lucy Stone. However, McMillen does not ignore less familiar reformers, and their inclusion adds both interest and historical depth to her work.

In an effort to contextualize the Seneca Falls Convention, McMillen devotes nearly 70 pages of her narrative to what came before it. Certainly readers who are unfamiliar with women’s roles in the early nineteenth century will appreciate the broad sweep of issues McMillen raises in the book’s early chapters. However, the presentation of this material is often difficult to follow, as McMillen jumps from theme to theme and back again, often without cohesion or explanation.

Despite the book’s title, very little of the narrative is concerned with the Seneca Falls Convention or the “origins” of the women’s rights movement. Only two chapters are devoted specifically to the antebellum or origins period, while much of the narrative focuses on the decades following the Civil War. In reality, McMillen provides a general synthesis of the nineteenth century women’s rights movement, and while readers interested deepening their understanding of this pivotal moment will likely be disappointed, those unfamiliar with the struggle for women’s political rights before 1890 will enjoy and benefit from the breadth of McMillen’s study.

Although the grand scope of McMillen’s topic would present a challenge to the expertise of any historian, what is perhaps the most unsatisfying aspect of this work is the nearly total lack of archival primary source research. Because of this, McMillen has not only repeated many of the factual errors of her predecessors, insuring that these misstatements and inaccuracies appear in other works for years to come, but most importantly, her decision not to engage with her subjects directly, prevents McMillen from offering the kind of analysis her subjects and this important historical moment deserve.

As a pivotal moment, few would argue that the Seneca Falls Convention marked an important milestone in the quest for women’s rights. However valuable McMillen’s work
is as a general interest synthesis of the nineteenth century women’s rights movement is, it leaves much to be desired both in terms of responding to current scholarship and in successfully proving her own sweeping thesis.

University of California Los Angeles

Linda Frank


Historians of the guitar’s career in the U.S. have tended to emphasize the instrument’s association with folk and popular idioms, and to portray it as a tool of resistance against mainstream values and elite musical tastes. In his book, The Guitar in America, Jeffrey Noonan argues that such portrayals ignore significant aspects of the guitar’s cultural history. Using the largely unstudied publications of the late nineteenth/early twentieth century Banjo, Mandolin and Guitar (BMG) movement as his primary sources, Noonan seeks to reconstruct an extended moment in American music history when the guitar rose to prominence as part of a cultivated rather than a vernacular musical world. According to Noonan, magazines such as S.S. Stewart’s Banjo & Guitar Journal (1882-1903), Cadenza (1894-1924), and Crescendo (1908-1934) “confirm that during the BMG era the guitar was a middle-class instrument used to instill and reinforce the cultural and musical values of America’s mainstream” (22). In the context of the BMG movement, guitar music circulated via musical notation rather than aural transmission, and aspirations towards musical refinement and cultural elevation existed alongside a commitment to commercial enterprise and entrepreneurship.

Through his careful reading of BMG periodicals, Noonan recovers the careers of instrument makers, pedagogues and performers long buried beneath the more widely celebrated aspects of the guitar’s history. Especially notable is his account of William Foden and Vahdah Olcott-Bickford, the most esteemed American guitar virtuosi of the early twentieth century. That Olcott-Bickford achieved such prominence as a female player and advocate of guitar artistry suggests that the guitar’s long-recognized association with masculinity was not so overarching at the time of the BMG movement’s ascendance as it was to become in later years; although Noonan also shows that stereotyped gender imagery was often used to promote the guitar through BMG publications.

Equally important is Noonan’s discussion of changes in guitar design during the period in question. According to Noonan, the most significant innovation in guitar design in the early twentieth century—the creation of the arch-top guitar—was the direct outgrowth of a larger trend towards the creation of hybrid instruments in which aspects of mandolin and guitar design fused together. Given that the first successful electric guitar model, Gibson’s ES-150—first issued in the mid-1930s—was effectively an arch-top with a pickup attached, Noonan credibly asserts that, “in some ways the addition of electricity was merely icing on the cake . . . the physical and technical roots of the new American guitar were planted firmly in the BMG movement’s promotion of the mandolin family” (136).

The Guitar in America does not tell as sweeping a story of the instrument as its title might suggest. The period studied by Noonan was also the time that saw the rise of blues guitar, Hawaiian slack key, and many other major developments that are mere background in this account. Nonetheless, Noonan has done readers interested in the guitar and the cultural history of American music a great service by recovering this little recognized moment when string instruments assumed a unique currency in the U.S.

The Welsh were hardly the most numerous of immigrants to America, but their importance to industrialization and the coal industry in particular was essential, far greater than their modest numbers might suggest. Furthermore, the cultural foundations they shared with mainstream white America allowed them a rapid, successful acculturation and a unique role in labor organization. This is the main thrust of Ronald L. Lewis’s *Welsh Americans*.

Lewis begins with a masterful survey of the background to Welsh emigration, including the rapid industrialization of Wales, working conditions, internal migration, attempts at reform and labor organization, and the patterns of the two phases of their migration to the United States—an early agricultural one, and an industrial one that became dominant in the mid-nineteenth century. Then he presents a chapter on Welsh settlement patterns throughout the United States and presents the ways in which the Welsh directly transferred modern coal mining to their new nation. Through many examples Lewis shows how the Welsh were most adept at opening and developing America’s coal mines and at rising within the industry. Using a large number of Welsh biographies from county histories and obituaries and newspapers, and an extensive data base from the Ohio census manuscripts, Lewis builds on the work of Rowland Berthoff, Bill Jones, and other scholars to add depth and context to an immigrant group that was crucial to American economic development. Particularly interesting and important is Lewis’s exploration of Welsh communities in America and how the Welsh entered a society that was “long familiar to them” because of a shared British and American culture based on the steady migration that began in 1607. Like other British immigrants, especially the English, the Welsh were seen not so much as foreigners or outsiders, but “cousins,” who were bringing vital skills, assimilating rapidly, and embracing republicanism and Protestantism. Thus they were generally welcomed and embraced by most Americans. They were not as “invisible” as many English immigrants, but were more so than other immigrant groups because most Welsh were fluent in English and were seen as adding to the prevalent Anglo-American culture.

After the Welsh established modern coal mining in America, owners and operators opted to hire unskilled workers from eastern and southern Europe, who were seen as more pliable and less likely to organize. Thus the Welsh moved more into supervisory roles, or they left mining altogether and enjoyed considerable social mobility in other areas of work. But in the meantime, they used British models to reform mining conditions and established and led the UMWA, culminating in the long reign of John L. Lewis, the son of Welsh immigrants. Chapters on the violent struggles between miners and capital, and details on the nature and conditions of mining in America—together with many fine illustrations—round out this superb and important addition to immigration and labor history.

Calvin College


Building upon his earlier work, *German-Speaking Officers in the U.S. Colored Troops* (2004), Martin W. Öfele here takes a broader, multi-ethnic look at the immigrant role in the U.S. Civil War. For the most part this is straight, chronological history largely structured around battles, although Öfele does present a broad sampling of immigrant voices from published primary sources, some of them in translations from his native German. By his
own admission, Őfele defines his task rather narrowly: Left out are ethnic Confederates as well as “ongoing political struggles on the home front” (xiii); even the Fremont presidential bid of 1864 that drew heavily on German support goes unmentioned. One of the strengths of this overview is the coverage given to smaller ethnic groups along with the Irish and Germans. Moreover, besides their relationship to the dominant Anglo-American society, their interactions with one another are not neglected. Reflective of Őfele’s previous work, he devotes considerable attention to ethnic attitudes toward slavery, emancipation, and African Americans slave and free, but he also give a disproportionate emphasis to the political refugees of 1848, and to higher officers rather than the rank and file.

Although Őfele corrects German ethnic enthusiasts who claimed two Hungarian Forty-eighers as their own, (66) he falls for a similar misattribution of Gen. William Rosecrans, (130, 148) in fact a descendant of 18th century Dutch immigrants. There are several other minor errors: “Hessian Frankfurt” (7) was actually a free city till 1866; the Italian Risorgimento is erroneously associated with “conservative restoration;” (11) a translation from the St. Louis Westliche Post is misattributed to Heinrich Boernstein, the editor of its cross-town rival, (xii, 163, n. 6) with no indication given that this entire article was previously translated in Germans for a Free Missouri. Nor would one know without digging deeply into the bibliographic essay that German letters from an anthology co-edited by this reviewer, frequently cited and ably translated in excerpts by Őfele, are now available in full English translation. (186) The publisher has made it unnecessarily cumbersome to check references: placed in the back, they are identified only by chapter number, not page, while in the text, running heads give chapter titles but not numbers. Perhaps because of length limitations, the last two years of the war from Chancellorsville on is allocated a mere twenty pages.

While a slim volume of 175 pages text can hardly be considered definitive, it presents a more nuanced view than any of its predecessors, correcting some of the stereotyping and ethnic cheerleading present in the work of Ella Lonn and her Germanophile sources. It replaces the Melting Pot thesis of John Higham and William L. Burton with a more accurate perspective that Civil War service often reinforced both the American and the ethnic identity: “Whether immigrants felt patriotic devotion to the Union, whether they abhorred slavery or got carried away by the excitement—most of them acted out of a combination of motivations that often involved a certain degree of ethnic consciousness.” (79)

Texas A&M University, College Station

Walter D. Kamphoefner


Civil War soldiers went into battle with specific views about heaven and life after death. They laid down their lives knowing that their sacrifice would be honored and remembered and that they would enter a heavenly landscape freed of physical affliction. “Americans in vast numbers,” writes Mark S. Schantz, “were willing to risk being torn to bits at precisely the moment that their culture told them that heaven would make their bodies whole.” (61)

Schantz’s study is at once concise and wide-ranging. In what the author describes as soundings into the vast antebellum literature and imagery of death, he examines theological constructions of heaven, the rural cemetery movement, death poems, lithography and photography. The American culture of death that he evokes may not have been as pervasive and uniform as Schantz suggests: his materials are drawn largely from the
Protestant Northeast and, perhaps, obscure regional, ethnic and denominational variations. But, the larger point—the existence of a distinctive culture of death—is convincingly and instructively made. Consider Abraham Lincoln’s famous “melancholy.” When melancholy is located in the culture of death, it becomes clear that it ought not be conflated with the post-Freudian concept of psychological depression. As Schantz observes, Lincoln “cultivated a disposition of melancholy” that contemporaries “viewed as one of his most endearing and laudable features.” (93)

Some of the clearest evidence of a distinctive culture of death emerges as Schantz examines antebellum memorial lithographs and the manner in which they were adapted for fallen Civil War soldiers. The images depicted memorial stones framed by weeping willows and mourners. On the face of the stone, the lithographer inscribed the words “In Memory of” but left the image largely blank for the consumer to complete. A similar Civil War lithograph, “The Soldier’s Grave,” retained the image of the memorial stone with the words “In Memory of” inscribed across the top. But, the image guided the consumer on what to write below the space provided for the name of the dead soldier. The words “of the” directed the consumer to enter the soldier’s regiment. The words “who died at” directed the consumer to record the name of a battle. Finally, above a death poem, the lithographer wrote for all consumers this judgment: “A Brave And Gallant Soldier And A True Patriot.” Introduced by Currier and Ives in 1862, “The Soldier’s Grave,” revealed a culture of death that drew a curtain over dysentery, mutilation and mass graves and structured a common memory for all dead soldier as purposeful warriors fallen in battle.

Something of the American culture of death accompanied soldiers into battle. But it is not at all clear that it contributed to an individual’s behavior under fire. Stories of bravery abound, but so, too, do stories of panic and desertion. When considering what prompted individuals to fight it is prudent not to minimize the thrill of battle. It was not the promise of an afterlife that commanders presented to their troops as they led them into battle—it was the excitement of the fight.

University of Missouri, St. Louis


In the mid-nineteenth century, William Mumler purported to be able to produce “spirit pictures” without trickery. These spooky images depict living sitters with their ghostly friends. Mumler charged sitters a hefty fee, and he was put on trial for defrauding the public. Kaplan’s book situates this odd practice of spirit photography at the nexus of cultural and photographic studies, and Mumler’s story is a test case of secularism/spiritualism, science/belief during the period of the U.S. Civil War. In fact, Mumler’s most famous image is of Mary Todd Lincoln with the ghostly apparitions of her deceased husband and son (Plate 1).

Kaplan’s two essays sandwich an array of fascinating primary source material. The introductory chapter, “Ghostly Developments,” is a wide-ranging exploration of the cultural issues surrounding Mumler: spiritualism, science, the press, visual entertainments, and mourning and death. Mumler’s case and Kaplan’s text bring in a number of important questions: Where did Americans stand in terms of science and religion? Could photography help reveal the invisible?

The intervening chapters are reprints of press clippings, primary texts, and a generous number of plates/figures without direct commentary from Kaplan (although these materials are treated in the two essays). The second chapter consists of news clippings,
most from the U.S. and UK Spiritualist press. The sole outlier comes from the *British Journal of Photography*; I wondered whether there were excluded articles either in mainstream publications (which figure prominently in the later “Trial” documents) or in the photographic press. Scholars will be delighted that someone else has rendered what I would imagine to be an unruly and unpleasant pile of microfilm into fascinating reading material about Mumler’s activities in 1862-3.

Further chapters deliver P. T. Barnum’s opinion on Mumler’s practice; it is quite astonishing to read how the master of humbuggery denounces the “delusions daily practiced upon the ignorant and superstitious” (68) in the spiritual photographer’s studio (but, presumably, not in Barnum’s establishment).

In the fourth chapter, Mumler himself speaks in the reprint of the 1875 autobiographical *Personal Experiences*. Since WorldCat records only three extant copies of Mumler’s *Personal Experiences*, Kaplan has certainly done researchers a favor. As Kaplan rightly points out in the concluding chapter, Mumler’s reflections on his photographic practice are—rather shockingly—without a sense of personal agency; Kaplan writes that spirit photography “converted William Mumler into an apparatus or an instrument manipulated and acted on by invisible powers.” (241)

The next chapters on the 1869 trial showcase the legal argument of Elbridge Gerry, who represented the people against Mumler, as well as coverage in the popular, spiritualist, and (one American) photographic news.

Kaplan’s concluding chapter is theoretically-oriented. It connects Mumler’s odd story to “spooked theories,” (215) which include Derrida’s concept of *hauntology*, Freud’s uncanny, and discourses on paranoia and mourning.

With the inclusion of rare primary materials, plentiful illustrations, and essays, the book is a useful and handy companion for those interested in the strange case of spirit photography.

Iowa State University
Emily Godbey


Martin Griffin (English, University of Tennessee) has conducted a close reading of carefully selected texts by five authors in order to highlight different modes of irony in post-Civil War literature, and argues that the South ultimately controlled the post-bellum battle to define what the war had been about. As he puts it, the defeated region “won the cultural struggle over American memory within twenty-odd years of the war’s end.” (15) His principal works, are James Russell Lowell’s Harvard Commemoration Ode (delivered July 21, 1865), matched with astute comparisons to poems by Whitman; Melville’s *Battle-Pieces and Aspects of the War* (1866); James’s *Bostonians* (1886); *Tales of Soldiers and Civilians* by Ambrose Bierce (1892); and *Lyrics of Lowly Life* by Paul Laurence Dunbar (1896).

At times the texts interconnect in intriguing ways. At a crucial moment in *The Bostonians*, for example, a southern man courting a Boston woman happen to stroll past the new Memorial Hall in Cambridge, the site of Lowell’s low-key delivery little more than a decade earlier. Striking differences in perspective between Bierce, James, and Stephen Crane are noted. Griffin’s familiarity with apt philosophical texts provides illuminating insights from Heidegger, Husserl, Kierkegaard (especially concerning irony), and Benjamin. Modern experts in critical theory (Kristeva, LaCapra, and others) are also invoked
to good purpose. Griffin wears his learning lightly. These allusions are not ornamental. Dunbar is surprisingly compared with Rilke and Frost—unlikely but apt.

The book makes an important contribution to the much-explored genre of collective memory studies by highlighting such naysayers as Bierce, Dunbar, and The Bostonians (the latter two barely mentioned in Daniel Aaron’s The Unwritten War: American Writers and the Civil War [1973]). Griffin explains that Ashes of the Mind is “an exercise in the recovery of memory, an effort to move the cultural furniture slightly to give a better view of an obscured pattern of American writing. Indeed, writing as memory, in certain instances even as countermemory that challenges an established consensus, is an explicit theme in this book.” (8) Hence the illuminated concept of countermemory provides a major contribution of the project and justifies its emphasis on some fairly neglected poetry.

In terms of its larger mission, the book is also a deliberate effort to divert attention from the in-depth treatment already devoted to such post-war writers as Whitman and Dickinson and, ultimately, “to look at the uncomfortable, ambivalent, and complicating presence of Civil War memory and commemorative culture” in northern literature as it transitioned from the gentility of Lowell to the proto-modern use of dialect in Dunbar’s “Corn-Song.” Symptomatic of Griffin’s focus is his observation that Melville’s Battlepieces and Aspects of the War “reveals an understanding that the memory of the war will likely be as distorted and misdirected as the proximate politics of the conflict themselves” (92).

Griffin insists upon “the ironies of American historical amnesia and [finds] the desire for an easygoing folk memory of an unproblematic national past” (208). I am not persuaded that it was unproblematic for everyone, as his own intriguing Coda reveals, nor that Basil Ransome in The Bostonians is altogether representative of a generalized triumph of southern perspective in what the author repeatedly calls the “American national imaginary.” Members of the GAR, so potent politically in the 1890s, might suggest otherwise.

Cornell University

Michael Kammen


This book is a welcome sequel to the author’s Abraham Lincoln and the Forge of National Memory (2000), which provided thorough coverage of the period from 1865 until 1915. This one devotes exhaustively researched chapters to the 1920s and Great Depression (a period considered by the author to have been the “apex” of Lincoln’s reputation); World War II; the Cold War, racial conflict, and contested images of Lincoln; the Civil Rights Movement and its complex impact on our perceptions of Lincoln; and what Schwartz calls “Fading Prestige, Benign Ridicule” that brings the story into the “post-heroic era.”

It is unfortunate that this book went into production in 2007 because crucial to the author’s central theme is the argument that there has been a steady decline of Lincoln’s “prestige” in American culture during the past two or three generations. Much of his evidence for the second half of the twentieth century is compelling, but Schwartz had no way of knowing that Barack Obama would make Lincoln such an iconic figure in his presidency, from using the Lincoln Bible for his own inauguration, and replacing a bust of Churchill in the Oval Office with Lincoln’s, not to mention all the analysts making endless connections and comparisons between the two presidents. Doris Goodwin’s Team
of Rivals (and other works) have done much to restore admiration for Lincoln’s savvy as a politician and wisdom as a statesman.

Be that as it may, readers should forgive the opening thesis statement because the book substantively adds a great deal to our understanding of Lincoln, social change, and American culture. Schwartz is the first to use public opinion polling data from 1950 through 2001 to get at what ordinary Americans thought and how they rated Lincoln in relation to Washington, Franklin Roosevelt, and John F. Kennedy. This is important because previous studies of Lincoln in American memory have primarily relied upon published texts (biographies, plays, poems, and tracts) rather than the views of Everyman.

The book is packed with arresting information and revisionism: turn of the century southerners were less hostile to Lincoln than we assumed because they sought national reconciliation; Republicans have managed to associate Lincoln with conservative views that he never espoused, such as making him an anti-statist libertarian; during the 1950s and ‘60s conservatives misquoted him in support of segregation; academics and others ascribed to Lincoln views about race that he did not hold (1960s-1980s); and “his imagined commitment to civil rights” now gets highlighted because of our own multicultural concern for social justice (142).

Schwartz contends that Lincoln’s prestige has declined since 1960 despite the ceaseless publication of so many laudatory books about him—arguing that what matters is not how much we know about the man but how we feel about what we know, an elusive point to demonstrate, even with polling data. Schwartz is persuasive, however, that by the 1960s Americans could no longer agree on what Lincoln stood for above all: preserving the Union or freeing the slaves. Lincoln’s “real” views on race became especially contested, with many (notably blacks) becoming increasingly critical based upon modern criteria of “equality.” Ultimately, Schwartz makes a sound case that during the generations he covers the nation moved from “reverence” (meaning a kind of adulation) for Father Abraham to “respect” for the Great Emancipator.

Cornell University

THE RISE OF MULTICULTURAL AMERICA: Economy and Print Culture, 1865-1915.

The aim of Susan L. Mizruchi’s ambitiously wide-ranging book, The Rise of Multicultural America: Economy and Print Culture, 1865-1915, can be glimpsed through the theoretical lens of Maurice Charland’s classic essay, “Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the Peuple Québécois,” [Quarterly Journal of Speech 73 (1987): 133-50]. Charland examined how then-contemporary rhetoric constituted a collective subjectivity—as a “people”—shared among French provincial separatists, linked them to a salient past for their independence project, and constrained its newly constituted audience to seek secession from Canada as something justified by the very act of rhetorical constitution. In her book, Mizruchi similarly attempts to acknowledge rhetorically, through “a literary-cultural study,” current-day American diversity as the essence of national identity with transhistorical roots dating to the period from the Civil War’s end to just before the U.S. entry in World War I. “I invoke ‘multiculturalism,’” she writes of a mid-twentieth-century term she dubs “deliberately anachronistic,” “to underscore continuities between past and present.” (3) By proffering a host of antecedents alternately embracing or decrying diversity, she, in short, invites her readers into a rhetorically-constituted subjectivity as an American people with a longstanding multicultural identity too often forgotten in today’s culture wars over issues like immigration and racial profiling. Social difference and
obsessing about it is nothing new. The possible actions that can follow from Mizruchi’s constitutive rhetoric include defending multiculturalism as something traditional against alarmists arguing that it is a historical departure and casting critics of it as predictably persistent, somewhat hackneyed, reactionary figures, almost folkloric landmarks within the landscape of cultural difference—gargoyles atop the American cathedral of diversity.

Mizruchi sees rapid and vibrant economic development as the wedge that opened the nation’s gates to cultural others. “An unrivaled expansion of the economy coincided with rising rates of immigration and migration,” she claims, “making economic forms and institutions singularly receptive to these mobile populations.” (289) A skeptic might argue that other countries had absorbed large labor forces from outside national boundaries or from among subalterns within, yet they maintained a single-dominant-culture hegemony that made the ethnic other virtually invisible while remaining stuck in lower-end occupations. Mizruchi accounts for this seeming American exceptionalism in two ways: 1) by recourse to the “social mobility” whipped dead by the New Social Historians of the 1960s and 1970s (she points to “much productive fusion of ethnic identities and economic aspirations”), and by reliance on a plausible if unproven assumption that “a developing print culture flourished through its incorporation and representation of this diversity.” (2, 289) Hence, her subtitle, “economy and print culture,” identifies what she sees as the motive forces behind the rise of multicultural America.

That Mizruchi summons “print culture” as a key signifier licenses her to move effortlessly between literature and society, for, as New Literary Historicists are wont, she shuffles together classic texts by Mark Twain or Charlotte Perkins Gilman, with subliterary ones like advertisements. The result shows that she more than met “the challenge of this book,” which she indicates “is to convey the breadth and complexity of these developments, while at the same time capturing the variety of ways in which American writers responded.” As a disciplinary achievement in English literary studies her book admirably succeeds in this. The book could be a very useful text for upper-level literature courses surveying the period, for it gives a robust and lively context for the writing. Moreover, paralleling the customary lecture sequencing of such courses, the book’s eight thematic chapters unfold in a rough chronology, from writers’ responses to the turmoil of the Civil War and its aftermath to their take on “the largely triumphant story of economic progress” albeit with waves of “human casualties” in its wake. (7)

Viewed interdisciplinarily, however, the book must be approached with some caution. There is slippage here between multiculturalism as a singularly positive value and as social fact spawning a range of pro-and-con positions. According to Mizruchi’s logic, the prevalence of grossly stereotyped and savagely demeaning racial and ethnic representations in the period’s print culture, especially in advertising, is part of the same multiculturalism producing W.E.B. DuBois’s Souls of Black Folks. Of the admen who “exploited racial nervousness… by filling their ads with assorted racial and ethnic ‘aliens,’” she claims: “By constantly invoking the source of anxiety and fascination, they sought to capture the attention of Americans by familiarizing what they feared.” (8) Certainly, the end product of such racial representation was not in all cases so felicitous. There is much interdisciplin ary scholarship that addresses representations of social difference as authored by people in diverse subject positions and as received by a range of audiences and readerships that include those supposedly being represented. Victims of such destructive imagery might not be so ready to accede that being represented, even if negatively, is somehow better than not being represented.

Mizruchi’s use of the term “print culture” delimits the sources she focuses upon, but it should not mislead readers into thinking that so-called history-of-the-book scholarship
informs her study. It is too bad, for some of those scholars have probed the relationship between print and national identity for its culturally hegemonic implications, despite representational diversity. Print culture specialists would be more attentive to how socio-economic power shapes media production and access, as well as to how ideologies, like pluck-and-luck and rags-to-riches, expressed in print, distorted social expectations. A more comprehensive survey of the cultural field of print would reveal countless publications, say, by the Wobbles or Knights of Labor, challenging the beneficence of what Mizruchi calls “full-scale consumer capitalism.” Finally, book historians might delve more deeply into the publishing histories of the texts she treats to consider them as efforts in their own right to constitute publics and counterpublics. In contrast to Mizruchi’s somewhat static multiculturalism, such work envisions the representation of difference in print culture as continually contested, frequently negotiated, and often resolutely polysemic.

University of Pittsburgh

STRANGE DUETS: Impressarios and Actresses in the American Theatre, 1865-1914.

In Strange Duets: Impressarios and Actresses in the American Theatre, 1865-1914, Kim Marra invites readers into the tumultuous world of late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-century theatre through an examination of the on-and-off stage relationships between leading ladies and the men who claimed to have fashioned their success. The text is a pièce de résistance of intersectional historical scholarship, analyzing the ways race, class, gender, and sexuality both influenced and were influenced by the relationships forged between men and women of the theatre during the wax and wane of Victorian sentiment, the emergence of Darwinian theories on evolution, and the rise of the New Woman. The book treats three iconic and enduring impresario-actress relationships that reflect the social tensions and changes in theatre of the period.

Augustin Daly and Ada Rehan, Charles Frohman and Maude Adams, and David Belasco and Mrs. Leslie Carter are three of the dynamic duos that dominate the “legitimate” American theatre during this period. Marra organizes her study into seven chapters, dedicating one chapter to each impresario’s early career development and dealings with women and a second chapter to their relationship with their primary leading lady. Due to the enormous success of their theatrical collaboration, David Belasco and Mrs. Leslie Carter warrant a third chapter. The case studies are fronted by an introduction in which Marra explains how these impresarios and actresses, “[r]ising up together from lowly ‘racial’ and class origins, . . . compelled intense fascination because of how, as highly visible celebrities, they played out these cultural tensions, both onstage in performance and, often most intensively and intriguingly, behind the scenes in the process of training and rehearsal” (xviii). The study concludes with an Epilogue which reads the legacy of such actress-impresario dealings through the late twentieth century musical hit The Phantom of the Opera, demonstrating how such “personal biography merges with wider social history” (259).

Through exhaustingly extensive archival research into primary sources including letters, journals, photographs, reviews, memoirs, and production ephemera, Marra painstakingly constructs a representation of these working and personal relationships that not only provides insight into the business of the professional theatre of the time, but also into the personal lives and loves of the individuals whose lives were inextricably caught up in the public performance of personal identity. Forty archival images reproduced within the text illustrate the fantastic lengths to which these artists spared nothing to create socially
acceptable representations of gender, sexuality, and race while creating opportunities for private lives and identities that often deviated from such norms a great deal. Marra skillfully weaves diverse interests in science, performance, religion, culture, and personal politics into a theatrical history that, like all great works of art, holds a mirror up to the nature of the society it represents while at the same time reflecting the broad interests and concerns of its contemporary audience.

University of Kansas

Jocelyn L. Buckner


Scrapbooks are the bane of archival processes, conservation practices, and of librarians in general, as the books bulge grossly with acidic tape, material objects, and loose pages. For the cultural historian, scrapbooks represent, in their unregulated messiness, a mountain of interpretative challenges. The creators of scrapbooks disordered the world around them and reordered it on the pages of their own book; relied upon commercial sources for books and scraps while assembling what look to be monuments of folk expression; hint at artistic creativity while insisting upon amateur status. These polarities are, of course, suspect as theoretical frameworks unless used as continuums of valuation, rather than oppositional categories.

Helfand’s volume on scrapbooks struggles mightily with these challenges of interpretation, and while at times Helfand succeeds at illuminating the social and historical contexts for scrapbooks, it will take a more traditional scholar to provide us with a full-length study of the phenomenon. The organization of the book is roughly thematic but themes such as “Time,” “Space,” and “Nostalgia” are under-developed and inconsistently applied. Change over time as an analytical approach is dispensed with overtly, since, the author argues, scrapbooks themselves resist chronological arrangement. However, more historically-grounded scholarship of recent years has demonstrated that scrapbooks have a distinct and traceable history framed in other literary practices and influenced directly by technological changes. There is a casual slippage of terminology (and hence, categories), such as the equation of collecting (an activity) with scrapbooks (specifically referred to as a category of objects) in the preface, and later in the same section, biography and autobiography are both used to describe scrapbooks as statements of self.

These criticisms reflect scholarly, historical issues that I have with the book. The volume is a gorgeous monument to the idiosyncratic beauty of scrapbooks dating from the mid-1800s to late 1990s. Helfand, partner in a prominent graphic design firm Winterhouse and co-editor of the influential blog Design Observer, has produced an extremely beautiful book. The extended horizontal format of the volume reflects the commitment to reproducing layouts of the scrapbooks. The full-color images are of very high quality, photographed and cropped with attention to detail, and reproduced with a uniformly lush texture so that the pages appear remarkably as if the actual scrapbook pages. This focus on the aesthetic qualities of the volume reflects Helfand’s own self-professed subjective approach, and is a cue for readers interested in a careful weighing of historical evidence that they may not be on the same page as the author. Don’t hate this book because it is beautiful; accept it for what it is. Helfand presents readers with an object of beauty that describes the beauty of those overlooked scrapbooks that only appear homely. Readers may not be persuaded by any historical or cultural arguments that Helfand presents; that work is better accomplished by recent or forthcoming scholarly works on scrapbooks.

Miami University of Ohio

Helen Sheumaker

Booker T. Washington remains an enigma to many. During his years of prominence, the 1880s through the early 1900s, nearly every race leader, at some moment in their career, adhered to Washington’s policy of race relations and though his critics grew in the twentieth century, his position as the black leader was firmly fixed until his death in 1915. He was viewed as a man of action, a symbolic leader who represented racial pride, self-determination, self-reliance, and progress. Despite this history, throughout the twentieth century, especially in the post-World War II era, the Wizard of Tuskegee and his program have provoked strong, often negative opinions. Washington became viewed as an apologist for segregation and disfranchisement—a backwards leader who was suppressing rather than uplifting the race. Such sentiment has continued despite the publication of August Meier’s *Negro Thought in America, 1880-1915* (1963) and Louis Harlan’s two-part biography, *Booker T. Washington: The Making of a Black Leader, 1856-1901* (1972) and *Booker T. Washington: The Wizard of Tuskegee, 1901-1915* (1983), all of which present a comprehensive vision of Washington as a race leader.

Robert Norrell’s *Up From History* is the first biography of Washington in a generation. Norrell believes that Washington must be remembered with more complexity and understanding, and argues that previous Washington scholars are partly to blame for the hits his image has taken in the twentieth century. He asserts that these authors were too influenced by their own times—post-war, civil rights, and Richard Nixon era America—and failed to place Washington in his world—the ugly reality of segregation, violence, and the south. By carefully accessing Washington in this violently uncertain world of post-Reconstruction, pre-World War I America, as well as taking black intellectual history outside the protest/accommodationist dichotomy, Norrell has successfully created a new Washington, one that was a talented, inspired, and imperfect political strategist struggling for the betterment of the black community and America as a whole. According to Norrell, Washington was an example to black America of how they could and would survive the “dark present.” “By building an institution [Tuskegee Institute] that demonstrated blacks’ potential for success and autonomy, he gave them reasons to have faith in the future.” (441) He did this along side his own, often clandestine, protestations against the developing Jim Crow system, as well as constantly battling black and white critics alike.

While Norrell’s work provides a new, more nuanced biography of Washington and his times, the author could have made more of a statement. Interestingly, while Norrell criticizes Louis Harlan for his portrayal of Washington he relies heavily on Harlan’s fourteen-volume collection of Washington’s papers, which more than Harlan’s biography, have shaped a generation of scholarship. Since their publication, almost all of the works discussing Washington have relied on this collection, and while it is admirable that Norrell develops a slightly new interpretation of Washington from these documents his work could have been strengthened if he had utilized the massive Library of Congress and Tuskegee manuscript collections to a greater degree. In the end therefore, Norrell has produced a solid biography and a fascinating read that adds to one’s understanding of Washington and will be debated in the field, but until scholars return to the archives and get outside of Harlan’s volumes we will not have a complete reinterpretation of Washington and his times.

University of Kansas

Shawn Leigh Alexander
When he died in 1899, the northern-born minister and educator in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Collins D. Elliott asked to be wrapped in an old Confederate flag and buried in his adopted southern homeland. For the last decades of his life Elliott had been an avid proponent of the Lost Cause movement and a vocal critic of southern evangelicals he accused of losing the real Civil War; the war that concerned the irascible Elliott most was not the one already decided on the field of battle but a continuing one between two opposing cultures. Elliott died before the outcome was clear, but as Joe L. Coker admirably demonstrates, he probably would not have liked how the story turned out. For in the decades between 1880 and 1915 southern white evangelicals were instrumental in transforming “the South into the standard-bearer in the agitation for national prohibition.” When and how the supposed keepers of the Lost Cause “came to embrace this traditionally Yankee reform movement” makes for a fascinating story (3).

Coker’s is not really a study of the prohibition movement as a whole, but of the role of white Tennessee, Georgia, and Alabama evangelicals in the movement and how their engagement in prohibition signaled important changes within white southern evangelicalism. Southern evangelicals created and then clung to a doctrine of “the spirituality of the church” in the middle of the 19th century to justify their separation from northern evangelical brethren as the nation was rending itself over issues of slavery and sectionalism. After the war the doctrine became an obstacle to modernizing ministers and laymen intent on shaping southern society by banning demon rum (and everything else alcoholic) from Dixie. A minister’s move from pulpit to poll could incite critics from within and without the church; as they moved from encouraging individual temperance among church members to drying up the South through legislation, evangelical prohibition activists had to overcome this legacy at the very time that southern society was changing dramatically.

Through thematic chapters on politics, race, honor, and gender, Coker explores the many ways in which white southern evangelicals were simultaneously shaped by and shapers of their cultural, political, and social environment. Their strategies to eradicate alcohol by pointing to its supposed effects on blacks heightened rather than ameliorated racial relations at the turn of the century. Thus the September 1906 Atlanta riots, four days in which white mobs attacked blacks throughout the city in response to a supposed string of black on white sexual assaults, helped Georgia evangelicals enact statewide prohibition before any other southern states. Presenting women as the helpless victims of alcoholism’s effects on men and society, paternalistic white evangelicals opened space for women’s cooperation and at least initially endorsed cooperation with the Women’s Christian Temperance Union (WCTU). But as the WCTU expanded its objectives to include woman suffrage, male denominational leaders became suspicious of southern women’s external political activism for prohibition and internal push for recognition of their leadership within churches and denominations. Thus most white evangelicals active in prohibition politics affiliated with the Local Option League, later the Anti-Saloon League, organizations to which Coker’s study pays too little attention. Readers interested in the politics of prohibition will realize this Coker’s not the full story, yet all should welcome this more complex view of white southern evangelicals and their relationship to southern society.

Home sewing has a long and, on its face, visible history. The quintessential women’s activity, it features prominently in pastoral visions of early American life, the woman bent over her needlework, children at her knees. Yet like many household tasks, sewing is skilled work that became economically invisible. Long recognized for its material value to households, by the early twentieth century sewing was lauded as a way to demonstrate love and nurturing abilities (pastoralized, Jeanne Boydston would say). Yet, historian Sarah A. Gordon argues, sewing also offered “boundless possibilities” of creative expression, including challenging or flouting socio-economic hierarchies. Gordon’s “Make It Yourself”: Home Sewing, Gender, and Culture, 1890-1930, is a study of the changing social and cultural practices, and multiple meanings, surrounding home sewing.

Gordon’s study illuminates how an apparently private activity was deeply enmeshed in both cultural norms and the public economy. Ready-made women’s clothing skyrocketed, while the number of women working for wages more than quadrupled to 10.8 million between 1880 and 1930. Economics dictated that many women continue to make at least some of their clothing (and new fashions were easier to sew and required less material), but they sewed for other motives as well. Home sewing became a contested space, sometimes a refuge for traditional gender, race and class ideologies and sometimes a tool women used to challenge them. Widespread sewing classes for young women and girls reinforced certain ideologies about region, race, and ethnicity as well as gender. Once sewing became optional for many, sewing-related businesses sought to maintain sales with explicit appeals to pastoralized womanhood or, sometimes, to flapper style-consciousness.

Despite these influences, Gordon argues, many women fashioned garments to express their individuality, to challenge racist views (of African-American women’s alleged immorality), to present a higher class status for themselves and families, to embrace new sporting possibilities, and to gain more power within households (perhaps the least supported argument). One wants more depth in some areas: for instance, she gives most of the credit for redefined femininity to middle-class white women’s embrace of sports, without engaging with Joanne Meyerowitz’s argument that urban working women pioneered behaviors and styles later associated with the “New Woman.” However, this is a minor quibble. Gordon’s book fruitfully draws together histories not usually in dialogue, of gender, business, and fashion, and of urban and rural America.

This ranges up shows in her sources: Gordon supplements more traditional sources with material culture items, examples of which are on display in the fascinating on-line version, http://www.gutenberg-e.org/gordon/, which was funded through a Gutenberg-e prize. (A joint project between the American Historical Association and Columbia University Press, Gutenberg-e publishes revisions of promising dissertations, chosen from 1999 to 2004, as online multimedia projects; see http://www.historians.org/prizes/gutenberg/Index.cfm.) Photographs, patterns, paper dolls, sewing journals, oral history recordings (oddly short), a hyper-linked appendix of sewing-related terms, and a slideshow of a contemporary home sewer (to illustrate the steps involved) all enrich the project. Succinct and richly illustrated, it is well suited for classroom use.

Western Kentucky University

Dorothea Browder

What is needed for a white wedding? Dress, cake, groom, bride. Chrys Ingraham’s White Weddings uses the typical ‘white wedding’ so popular in the United States to investigate normative heterosexuality, globalized economic structures, and the impact of popular culture on ritualized aspects of life. This second edition has benefited from the addition of new material, with Ingraham closely examining the role globalization has played in the manufacture of material items related to the standard white wedding, such as the elaborate dress the bride may wear. Ingraham highlights the ironic disjuncture between the romanticized image of the white dress, with the grueling and exploitative conditions of its creation by women, for women. This is not a book about white weddings as it is about the ways modern weddings represent an enactment of heterosexual privilege, and how the wedding is the result of an industry of various elements, from periodicals to jewelers to clothing manufacturers.

Much of the information Ingraham presents is interesting and sometimes thought-provoking, but there is inconsistent analysis. The author often restates a complicated theoretical argument succinctly, follows with a list of examples, sometimes explicitly related to the stated interpretation. Perhaps such lists of ‘facts’ persuade otherwise reluctant undergraduates that the theoretical statement may in fact be applicable, but for a reader more interested in an in-depth investigation of the workings of cultural life, the examples prove frustrating. In addition, at times, illustrative examples are either not clearly linked or misplaced in the text. A list of rote phrases used in all film and television weddings studied by the author (such as “I’ve waited my whole life for this day”) illustrates, for Ingraham, “the intense socialization effort that the wedding-ideological complex has undertaken in constructing femininity.” (175) What is disconcerting is that the list of incantations (“It’s my wedding day!”) is not related by the author to her earlier discussion of the ritualistic aspects of media messages about weddings.

White Weddings is positioned as an undergraduate textbook; the publisher has a website with powerpoint lecture slides for one chapter, for example. Unfortunately, the text does not provide the apparatus that would make the book eminently usable in the classroom. Key concepts are inconsistently italicized, the index is insufficient and not related to key concepts (for example, there is no entry for “Ritual”). Complex theoretical ideas are clearly and admirably defined. As an introductory text to studying contemporary popular culture, White Weddings offers an attractive topical focus with some weaknesses of approach and presentation.

Miami University


Henry James’s comment that he owed any advantage gained from his visit to Florida to “the rightly averted, and the rightly-directed eye” is of a piece with Kendall Johnson’s important study of Henry James and the Visual (letter to Witter Bynner, 17 February 1905). For at the foundation of James’s strategy as a novelist and critic is the relation of seeing to thinking and knowing. This relation engages Kendall Johnson in terms of the discourse and representational strategies of the picturesque. As a result, Johnson’s study explains an important element of James’s narrative style and also puts readers in contact with the nineteenth-century discourse of the picturesque.
Johnson distinguishes “visual” from “vision” in order to “emphasize sight as a process that is allusive and elusive in establishing meaning within and between social contexts” (6). Crucial for Johnson in the picturesque are human figures because they organize the narrative logic of any scene. James’s invocation of the picturesque signals “moments when the pride of his characters balances precariously on their management of insecurities regarding how to recognize, classify, and, ultimately, respect national identity in the international marketplace” (9). Thus the picturesque supplies a way for understanding “the role of visual language in representing types of national culture, and, more broadly, in conceptualizing ‘culture’ as the kernel of national cohesiveness” (4).

Following the “Introduction,” Johnson organizes Henry James and the Visual via five chapters and an “Epilogue.” “Classifying Donatello: the visual aesthetics of American exceptionalism” models Johnson’s strategy for showing “how visual aesthetics arbitrate national identity” (28). “A ‘dark spot’ in the picturesque: the aesthetics of polygenism in ‘A Landscape-Painter’” illustrates James’s intervention in the discourse of the picturesque. “Rules of engagement: the arch-romance of visual culture in The American” explains how “[t]he racial terms of the novel’s cultural categories […] invite us to consider the novel’s generic confusion as related to broader, contemporaneous scientific debates regarding the definition of ‘culture’ as a category of identity that could be displayed as a collection of things at international exhibitions” (90). “The scarlet feather: racial phantasmagoria in What Maisie Knew” attends centrally to the representation of the “‘brown lady,’” an “American Countess” (123), which “fans ambiguity of racial type at the very intersection of British interests in India, Africa, Asia, Australia, and North America” (125) and “call[s] attention to the ways stereotypes of Indians fit into the international network of race that James sensationalizes” (126). “Pullman’s progress: the politics of the picturesque in The American Scene” investigates James’s use of the urban picturesque and distinguishes James’s “picturesque eye” (160) from those of his contemporaries and also from those, such as Emerson’s, whose example established the picturesque mode in the generation before James’s. In this chapter, Johnson recognizes meaning in James’s “failure to build a national scene,” which “dramatizes the social effect of feeling one’s cultural authority dissipate” (177). “Epilogue: America seen” provides an overview of how Fanny Kemble’s “visual methods” in A Journal of a Residence on a Georgian Plantation in 1838-1839 “influenced [James’s] engagement with the crisis of slavery and its civil legacy” (190).

One gap in the book has to do with a nuanced discussion of both particular rhetorical situations James engages that probably affected the deployment of the picturesque and his deployment of indirect discourse, through which a narrator / narrative persona reports a character’s vision of the picturesque. That is, all passages of the picturesque aren’t equally “James’s,” at least in any straightforward way.

Nonetheless, Henry James and the Visual is well worth reading for anyone interested in understanding the powerful representational effect and meaning of the picturesque during the nineteenth century and, especially, for learning how that mode was used and complicated by Henry James. Center for Henry James Studies. Creighton University. Greg Zacharias


Historian Leigh Ann Wheeler meticulously traces an understudied but important area of women’s activism in during the early-twentieth-century. Men may have dominated the anti-obscenity reform movement from the late nineteenth century to about 1910 and
then again after the mid 1930s, but women owned the time in between. During this era of tremendous cultural, political, and economic change, women such as Catheryne Cooke Gilman, one of the founders of the Minneapolis Women’s Cooperative Alliance and a member of the National Parents and Teachers Association, and Alice Ames Winter, head of the powerful General Federation of Women’s Clubs and founder of the Minneapolis Woman’s Club, articulated the contours of anti-obscenity reform.

It was a difficult battle and one that exposed the growing fractures in what Wheeler calls the “politics of womanhood,” an assumption of female activists that women “shared a superior moral sensibility that would unite them to protect children by condemning obscenity and commending sex education.” (2) By 1935, it was clear to women reformers that the myth of female unity for a common cause had fallen flat. Women may have wanted to clean up the cultural temptations of the modern age—especially the movies that were becoming increasingly popular in the 1920s—yet differed on how to define what was obscene and what was not. More problematic was the question of method: what was the best way to ensure that nothing inappropriate, particularly for children, slipped through? Outright censorship? Reviewing films locally and then giving a seal of approval, or not? Federal regulation? Working with the film industry (and William Hays) to create “better films?” These splits eventually opened the way for the male led Catholic Legion of Decency to assume control of the movement by 1935.

One of Wheeler’s most interesting chapters examines women reformers and an approach they used to battle obscenity in the wider culture: sex education. As she notes, sex education was nothing new, but turn of the century advice geared toward males focused on the negative aspects of sex, especially venereal disease, and usually advocated celibacy. Female reformers took a different approach. In the wake of World War I, alliance women in Minneapolis worked closely with the U.S. Public Health Service to distribute social hygiene information to families, but they soon considered the focus on sexually transmitted diseases too narrow. Sex education, in the alliance’s eyes, needed to reach mothers and children. Women reformers committed themselves to a tireless campaign of providing written information, conducting workshops about sex education, and discussing concerns with families. By 1922, they had reached “a remarkable 75 percent of all Minneapolis mothers.” (120) Reformers believed that children were going to be exposed to sex in the modern culture no matter what happened. It was up to the parents, then, to determine where the child would receive that information (or misinformation). If parents, armed with knowledge from the alliance, could provide accurate advice to their children, then those children would not be so easily influenced by those with, as the alliance warned, “distorted minds or sordid interests.” (121)

Wheeler’s impressively researched study is essential reading for anyone interested in the history of anti-obscenity reform and women’s activism in general.

Indiana Perdue Fort Wayne (IFPW) Christine Erickson


We have been looking at the Progressive muckraker Jacob Riis for a long time now, regarding him for years in somewhat mythical terms, as the revolutionary founder of documentary photography, a great humanist, a liberal champion of the poor, and a photographer of subtle aesthetic purpose. More recently, he has been seen as a slide-show performer, a popular entertainer with deeply ingrained racial prejudices, whose photo-
graphic “surveillance” of society worked to strengthen barriers of class. This volume by photographic historian Bonnie Yochelson and cultural historian Daniel Czitrom—funded by an NEH Collaborative Research grant—deepens the story of Riis’s career and in the process corrects our vision in several important respects. Most importantly, it presents Riis as an accidental photographer with a purely functional relationship to the medium rather than a covert artist with aesthetic purposes.

Czitrom’s Riis embodies a linear trajectory, from impoverished Danish immigrant to police reporter on the Lower East Side to friend and associate of powerful reformers and politicians, including Theodore Roosevelt. Czitrom constructs a rich social and historical context for Riis’s career, including his many journalistic predecessors and influential reformers like Felix Adler and Lawrence Veiller. Yet Riis is also a “deeply contradictory figure” (xv): if his goal was to improve the lot of the new immigrants, Riis was far from advocating radical social change and in fact was suspicious of organized labor; rather, he sought improvements in living conditions, arguing for stronger laws governing tenement housing and appealing to private philanthropy in the name of Christianity. Riis’s belief in the dominant power of the environment to shape people’s lives shared the same room with his belief in the fixity of ethnic and racial characteristics. Downplaying Riis’s ethnic stereotyping (“a reassuring cultural ‘mapping’ of exotic others for its genteel audience,” [71]), Czitrom stresses Riis as a proto-social scientist, using statistics, charts, graphs, and photographs, along with dialect humor and shocking anecdotes, to get the attention of his audience, both in print and on the lecture circuit.

Part of the problem with coming to terms with Riis as a photographer is our knowledge that he worked with other, professional photographers in his work, hiring them to take pictures he was interested in and sometimes giving them credit, sometimes not. Learning the techniques, he eventually would take a good many photographs himself, but he largely abandoned photography, except for sporadic later uses of the camera, after his major works came out—How the Other Half Lives (1890) and the more optimistic Children of the Poor (1892). Yochelson elucidates, in more detail than we have hitherto known, Riis’s photographic colleagues, arguing that throughout his career Riis was focused on the subject itself and its relationship to his narrative, and not on the aesthetic composition of the image. He thought of himself as a collector of images—whatever the source—rather than as a photographic auteur. (Interestingly, he even used the early work of Lewis Hine.)

This is a convincing argument, and Czitrom and Yochelson have expertly clarified a good deal in Riis’s career, but they largely neglect the question of how and why these images have worked so powerfully on their audiences, even until today.

Temple University Miles Orvell


Catherine Chaput offers a rigorous and accessible analysis of the contradictory articulations of the U.S. public research university (hereafter: USPRU) since its emergence in the late 1800s. Articulations is an appropriate word here, as Chaput analyzes the political economic linkages between the USPRU, the state, and the market in three phases of capitalist development (industrial, monopoly, and global). She also demonstrates how these linkages are expressed and clarified in rhetorical processes “that mediate political
messages, move them through institutions, and produce a specific model of education.”

(2)

For Chaput, the purposes defined for, and the actual uses of, the USPRU result from an interplay of valuations made—through rhetorical processes—between the political, economic, and cultural domains of the university. Chaput uses a “rhetorical hermeneutics of valuations” to show how this interplay constructs a “rhetorical boundary” that “outlines possibilities…and offers understandings about the appropriate knowledges, pedagogies, and professional work contained by [the university].” (21) This approach is illuminating when Chaput shows how the somewhat competing interests between early industrialists, the state, and local communities were partially resolved by rhetorically linking the land grant university with identifications of local communities. Chaput later puts paid to the idea of the market’s “invisible hand,” particularly during the monopoly phase of capitalism, where she unravels strategic interchanges between the government, USPRU, and business, particularly that associated with the then emerging military industries. USPRU emphases on military industries and workplace psychology did not materialize because “Joe, the Citizen or Line Worker” demanded new sciences to rework his perspective on foreign policy or management and workplace conditions. Rather, these emphases emerged because people’s interests in citizenship and labor and notions of individualism were rearticulated, albeit in occasionally contradictory ways, with government and industrial interests in military technologies and a cult of efficiency.

Analyzing USPRU mission statements in the global capitalist stage, Chaput demonstrates how mission statements mask and illuminate the often contradictory purposes universities must serve in relation to political, cultural, and economic stakeholders on local, state, national, and international levels. The “rhetorical” face of the university put forth in mission statements, as Chaput shows, produces material consequences in terms of the allocation of resources to—and within—the university, the definition of curriculum, and the legitimation of particular modes of pedagogy and research. The “structural adjustment” that is happening in the USPRU is related, Chaput carefully argues, to the structural adjustment of entire economies abroad because the USPRU model is exported by global economic organizations as a condition of structural adjustment agreements.

In comparison to the thick analysis that constitutes her argument about the contemporary articulations of the USPRU, Chaput’s response—working class professionalism—seems slightly thin. Chaput’s historical materialism emphasizes macro-level forces—at the level of the USPRU and its interplay with the state and cultural and economic institutions. Yet, Chaput’s working class professionalism is constituted primarily by micro-level activities (e.g., classroom pedagogy and transdisciplinary projects) where what she calls “guerilla knowledges” can be created and deployed. Such activity is both interesting and important, especially given the ways Chaput conceptualizes this type of work, but it also needs to be linked to a more fully conceptualized praxis beyond the classroom—in and between the sites where, as Chaput convincingly demonstrates, the rhetorical boundaries of the university are constructed most powerfully. Perhaps another installment is in the offering and will correct for this minor contradiction. I would read it, and others in various fields would likely benefit from it as much as they would from the rich analysis and historical insight that constitutes the bulk of this astute volume.

Eastern Michigan University

Christopher G. Robbins
Jeffrey Geiger’s *Facing the Pacific: Polynesia and the U.S. Imperial Imagination* faces a range of postcolonial risks as theorized by Rod Edmond in *Representing the South Pacific: Colonialist Discourse from Cook to Gauguin* (1997), who had warned (while tracking earlier British white mythologies in this region) that “to concentrate on the conventions through which a culture [like indigenous Polynesia] was textualized [by the British] while ignoring the actuality of what was represented is to risk a second-order repetition of the images, typologies, and projections under scrutiny.” (20) Concentrating on the slipperiness of race, as it turns from trope into type, and history as it hardens from observation and document into myth, Geiger is wary of these risks, projections, and geo-psychic limitations in mapping the U.S. white-settler’s self-consolidating discursive archive, while fronting or “facing” (putting a racial face upon, as he shrewdly puns) the Pacific as a westward-facing region in the wake of literary-historical agents like David Porter, Herman Melville, Hubert Howe Bancroft et al. “He [Melville] saw a garden. We saw a wilderness,” is how Jack London staged this all-too-pastoral downfall from Eden, as his yacht took anchor in the modern Marquesas and lamented generations of Euro-American disfigurement of which his writing was both symptom and critique.

If this U.S. vision of the American Pacific secured through commerce, missionary work, cultural power, and war, did not solidify into full global hegemony until after World War II, Geiger’s focus upon what he calls the “long 1920s” of the “Polynesian vogue” does track a set of ideological and discursive slippages that reveal an abiding American ambivalence towards becoming an imperial power in a region viewed (as by London) both as site of regeneration and critique as well as an ethnoscape of ruination, displacement, and loss. “In the various writings of missionaries, beachcombers, and other resident aliens in Polynesia,” (69) Geiger writes from within this white-colonial heart of darkness, “one can perceive the persistent echo of separation from and critical reflection on western cultures, often conjoined with idealistic desires to cross cultural lines and escape, efface, or renew western selfhood.” (69)

Beyond so many situated readings of colonial mythic and anticolonial strands in our quasi-expansionist discourse, what Samoan novelist Albert Wendt has long lamented as papalagi [white] fantasies and hang-ups in such texts of “mythical reverie,” the postcolonial theorist might well ask, what does this book add as a critical reading of the “US imperial imagination”? Or, more specifically, what does it add to our thick-descriptive understanding of what Paul Lyons has called “American Pacificism” in this region, that is, a discursive archive circulating and consolidating American power and hegemony across the twentieth century in the Pacific? Does what Geiger calls “the myth of [the South Pacific or Polynesia as] a primitive people frozen in time” (1) tell us much new about the region or the “imperial power networks in which their [modern American] works and lives were embedded”? (9)

Exposing the Pacific as what Bancroft in 1900 called “the arena of international power [into which the United States entered] as a colonizing force,” (51) Geiger’s well-researched study of U.S. Polynesian themed texts succeeds in outlining and critiquing specific racial and geopolitical entanglements, ambivalences, slippages, and blockages in a well articulated set of literary, filmic, and ethno-cultural documentary works. These texts from the “long 1920s” of the modernizing region interlock, build upon, and challenge one another in a kind of racial, transnational, and ethnographic colloquy. Working from the assumption of textual instability and contextual transaction, Geiger exposes a set of
self-consolidating formations by which cultural and racial otherness has been enlisted to serve fantasy and power in the American Pacific of the twenties and thirties, read as world heir to the “structures of European colonial power it both contested and inherited.” (16)

Bracketing Hawai‘i as a crucial component in the making of this “Polynesian” symptom of the U.S. colonial presence, by the debatable assumption that by the 1920s “Hawai‘i had been incorporated into an imagined U.S frontier, having lost its mystique for the traveler in search of an ‘unmapped frontier,’” (14) Geiger narrows his focus to the South Seas. He includes detailed and situated studies of American Pacific portrayals as set in the Marquesas (the caustically uncanny journalist Frederick O’Brien’s *White Shadows in the South Seas* [1919]), Western Samoa (Frances Hubbard and Robert J. Flaherty in works of erotic ethnography like *Moana*), Tahiti (the uneasily matched Flaherty and Director W. S. Van Dyke for MGM in the pre-Production Code era), as well as Bora Bora and Morea (Flaherty and expatriate German Director F. W. Murnau). Geiger’s chapter five on “The Homoerotic Exotic” shakes up the hetero-normativity of the Pacific contact-zone with elaborated homoerotic excursions into the works of C. W. Stoddard who queers the Victorian-era Pacific into Polynesian beefcake and converts this beloved savages into figures of polymorphous release.

Geiger’s deep immersion in the dialogics of anthropology as well as the richly ironic perspectivalism of literary and filmic forms helps to estrange, challenge, if not undermine the white-centered U.S. framework, in exacting, shrewd, and helpful ways. Fantasy and geopolitics are shown to interact in unstable ways across the modernizing American Pacific so that, in effect, such texts can help loosen the relations of power as a hold upon people, place, custom, race, or nationhood. Culture is shown to do the work of symbolic transaction, historical recall, if not a kind of geo-psychic conversion, as the “white shadows” are shown to haunt each scene of colonial and techno-mimetic encounter. In detail and overview, *Facing the Pacific* elegantly fills in an important gap in our understanding and un-learning of the American Pacific as a postcolonial region of contact, entanglement, possibility, and release.

University of California-Santa Cruz

Rob Wilson


In *Radical L.A.* Errol Wayne Stevens tells a compelling narrative history of the political struggles between labor and capital in Los Angeles during the first half of the twentieth century. *Radical L.A.* chronicles the actions and ideologies of the key players and organizations among L.A.’s “radical Left” and “radical Right” in their prolonged struggle to define the parameters of municipal government and civil society. Although both were connected to spectacular acts of public violence at different times—the Left with the bombing of the *Los Angeles Times* building in 1910, and the Right with continual police brutality (and spying)—Stevens designates both Left and Right as “radical” more to call attention to the large influence these two relatively small groups played in the political and public affairs of Los Angeles. The Left consisted of trade unionists, Socialists, Wobblies (in the ‘10s and ‘20s), and Communists (more influential in the ‘30s and ‘40s) who were members of interconnected (but also conflictual) labor and political organizations. The Right was made up of the business elite, spearheaded by the conservative *Los Angeles Times* and The Merchant and Manufacturers Association with the Los Angeles Police Department to do their bidding. Class conflict between the “Socialist Left” and the “capitalist oligarchy” revolved around a fairly constant set of issues throughout the first
half of the twentieth century. For the Left, the right to organize unions and the desire to secure adequate social provision for all citizens were paramount. For the Right, the open shop and unfettered profit were of overriding importance.

The strengths of *Radical L.A.* are many. It very usefully synthesizes previous Los Angeles political history that has focused more singularly on biographies of leaders or histories of organizations/institutions within either the Left or the Right. On the Left, examples include Upton Sinclair and his “End Poverty in California” campaign for Governor, or the socialist philanthropist John Randolph Haynes. On the Right examples include Pacific Electric streetcar/real estate magnate Henry Huntington, or owners of the *Los Angeles Times*, Harrison Gray Otis, Harry and Norman Chandler. Stevens’ approach allows for a more complex explanation of the degree to which L.A. city politics were driven by the dynamic interactions between Left and Right. Another strength is that Stevens contextualizes these local political struggles within the histories of larger scale political movements in California (at times making useful comparisons to the stronger Left political traditions of San Francisco) and the nation.

Stevens is notably thorough in his explanation of the leaders and organizations of both camps. Stevens’ attention to the Left, carefully detailing the ideological jockeying, and directives from labor unions, Socialist and Communist leadership that determined the goals of and outcomes of political activity is perhaps the most significant contribution the book makes to Los Angeles historiography. Stevens corrects the perception that Los Angeles was *only* a stronghold of conservatism. For Stevens the predominantly white labor/Left that he focuses on throughout most of the book constitutes a less known “progressive political tradition” (310) in L.A. history. Its recovery provides a foundation for future scholars.

When it was a central issue to the political struggles over municipal government in Los Angeles, Stevens perceptively attends to issues of race, drawing from recent scholarship on the history of African American and Mexican American Los Angeles (but much less on Japanese American or Chinese American Los Angeles), especially during the 1930s and 1940s. Stevens’ argument is that the class struggle which defined Los Angeles politics during the first half of the twentieth century was replaced by civil rights struggles and politics of race after 1965. While Stevens is right to point out that non-whites were a demographic minority and were almost totally excluded from the political affairs of the city by organizations and leaders on the Left and the Right, this narrative leaves out the extant histories of the political efforts of leaders and organizations from Los Angeles’s ethno-racial communities to secure greater inclusion in the political affairs of the city. Perhaps such politics, more community and social movement based, are too different than the more formal electoral and organizational politics of municipal reform Stevens focuses on. If that is the case, then it will be up to future scholars to formulate a definition of politics that includes both. *Radical L.A.* is a very important contribution to Los Angeles history. It provides the foundation for a more comparative synthesis of L.A. scholarship that will tell the multi-racial history of Los Angeles’ politics.

California State University Los Angeles

Michael Willard


This is a curious book. Catherine Parsons Smith has mined numerous archives in southern California and elsewhere to turn up nuggets about the history of “music making,” as she puts it, in Los Angeles from the 1880s through the 1930s. She begins with
the popularity of opera during the 1880s boom era and concludes with the Federal Music Project during the Great Depression. Her primary argument is that classical music (mainly symphony concerts and opera) became increasingly marginalized by the end of the 1920s by the larger forces of commercialized popular music. The book, described as a “social history,” consists of fifteen chronological chapters, inspired by the impressive work of Charles Bagley’s 1920s history of Los Angeles concert and band music.

The book is at once revisionist and traditional. It is revisionist in the sense of arguing for a thriving classical music tradition in Los Angeles during the Progressive era by uncovering vital yet almost forgotten individuals, yet it is traditional in being largely descriptive of people and events. An in-depth analysis that supports her thesis is largely lacking. As a result, there are marvelous sections on the Los Angeles Women’s Orchestra, on the early history of the Hollywood Bowl, and on African American art music, yet little effort to bring all of these subjects together in a cohesive narrative, and little explanation as to why the classical music tradition became marginalized.

One example is the discussion of modernism in Los Angeles: surely a defining aspect of art culture in the region. The assertion is advanced that modernism was well-received at first yet lost much of its audience by the mid-1920s. Yet the author bases this assertion mainly on the reception of modernist composers Dane Rudhyar and Henry Cowell (although the latter spent little time in Los Angeles), offering little other evidence to support her claim. Moreover, the year 1926 as a turning point without explaining why. Such omissions are a great pity, because the author’s careful archival research is not readily reflected in her conclusions.

Numerous historical errors and editing issues mar the book further. Los Angeles did not begin as a “Mexican mission settlement” (4) but as a colonial outpost of the Spanish empire; the city was founded in 1781, not 1791; (15) Anglos did not begin arriving in the 1840s but in the 1820s, (15) and so on. For a book that claims to be a social history, little attention is given to the work of historians or is even misrepresented, such as Lawrence Levine’s supposed lack of attention to symphonic music in Highbrow/Lowbrow. (160) While the author is careful to avoid jargon, problematic sentences do crop up, such as: “Music making, an important element of everyday life all along, was at a high point and growing, much of it seemingly unchanged in nature, although now it coexisted less comfortably with commercial mass culture, which was growing even faster.” (188) The book would have benefitted from more attentive editing.

University of La Verne

Kenneth H. Marcus


Francesca Morgan’s ambitious and impressively researched book examines women’s organizations and the intersection of race, gender, and nationalism from the 1880s through the 1930s, with an epilogue that covers the later years of the twentieth century. She focuses on four main groups, the National Association of Colored Women (NACW), the Women’s Relief Corps (WRC), which was the only interracial group, and two hereditary groups that restricted membership to whites only, the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR) and the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC). Other all-female voluntary organizations help round out her analysis of how women shaped and interpreted patriotism and nationalism, how the various groups sought to educate society about their respective visions of history, and the extent to which their activism and beliefs changed over time.
Morgan divides her book into five chronological chapters (The Nation, The Empire, The State, The War, The Security State), and within each chapter, closely explores each group’s efforts to make their voices heard in a country that was undergoing vast social, economic, and political change. Central to Morgan’s argument is women’s conscious desire to not only reach a national audience and to foster a sense of nationhood in a country still healing from the Civil War, but to also define “nationalism so that it encouraged their own political activism outside their households and [to attach] broad political importance to that activity.”(2) This “women-centered nationalism,” explains Morgan, stretched across a wide spectrum that ranged from state-based nationalism (advocated by the DAR and the WRC, both of which stressed loyalty to a reunited country), to a neo-Confederate nationalism (championed by the UDC, which argued that any recognition of a nation needed to take into account the sacrifices of the Confederacy), and to African American women’s civic nationalism, which sought both loyalty to country and a more prominent leadership role for women. Women-centered nationalism also amplified the idea of female cultural and moral superiority, a sentiment long held in nineteenth century America, to support women’s authority on matters concerning the nation and state.

Women were thus responsible for taking the abstract ideals of nationalism and creating them into more concrete symbols of commemoration, such as the erection of plaques and highway markers, the celebration of patriotic holidays, the preservation of old battle sites, and the retelling of stories about past sacrifices. As Morgan notes, they “helped draw the ‘island communities’ of yore into the increasingly interconnected United States of the twentieth century.” (5) The turning point for women was World War I. As the country prepared for war and as fear about radicalism reached America’s shores, women’s groups shifted their focus to a more male-centered nationalism—one that “reassigned cultural and moral authority to men.” (5)

Morgan makes an important contribution to the study of nationalism, and, not surprisingly, she further illustrates that including women, as well as the categories of race and gender, enriches our understanding of how national identity is formed.

Indiana Perdue Fort Wayne


Phillip Thurtle presents an intriguing but ultimately too ambitious examination of biology as Gregor Mendel’s “genetics” comes to explain what had been known as “heredity” in the early 20th Century. In a nicely sustained concluding discussion, Thurtle exemplifies this transition by looking at the contrasting yet complementary views of botanist Hugo deVries and naturalist David Starr Jordan on the work of plant breeder Luther Burbank. Jordan had invited deVries to Stanford University where he was president in July 1904. DeVries, one of the rediscoverers of Mendel, admired the scope and industrial scale of Burbank’s creation of plant hybrids, while, for Jordan, Burbank’s continued to use an older approach of observing phenomena in their varied landscapes. Thurtle’s insight is that information processing systems are shifting in this period, reflecting the “two sets of logics developed from two mutually supporting but distinctly different spatial and temporal practices” (307).

Thurtle further develops the idea of this older “panoramic mode” in relation to Spencer Fullerton Baird’s organization of natural history expeditions for the Smithsonian Institution when he was its assistant secretary. Creating through specimen collection panoramas, both over a species range and of the variety of species from a locale, Baird
was able to make more usable the discoveries of Smithsonian expeditions. Baird took advantage of such technological developments as the Wooten patent desk (he did not, however, use the newly introduced vertical file system before his death in 1887) to organize this information.

Jordan, as a naturalist he was a protege of Baird’s, helped build Stanford University as one of the United States’ great private universities as its first president. Leland Stanford’s wanted to use the major professor system of another of Jordan’s mentors, Andrew Dickinson White of Cornell University to create a university that would forge leaders of industry with practical skills. So he hired Jordan from Indiana University with just that aim.

Stanford also figures in Thurtle’s first important episode, the development of trotter horse breeding as a hobby for the emerging captains of industry in the late 19th Century. Effectively using Edith Wharton’s subtle literary depictions of the social nuances of New York society, Thurtle situates this emerging hobby for the rich as a cultural phenomenon. Heredity, national and regional identity, and industrial practices are all factors giving depth to what seems at first glance be yet another frivolity of the rich.

Thurtle’s use of other literary figures—Theodore Dreiser and Jack London, in particular—to reflect key features of his argument is strong and inviting. Frustrating, though, are the long stretches of dry theoretical exposition establishing analytical tools that are not given a sufficient test on a too small handful of historical moments—trotter horse breeding, Smithsonian expeditions, and Luther Burbank—that are meant to capture American culture just as genetics is emerging.

These tools can be useful, but there is more work to be done to explore the emergence of genetic rationality, shaped, as Thurtle suggests, by developments in industry, information, and institutions.

Webster University

Kim Kleinman


Nowadays there are two styles of writing urban history. The first is what one might call the “bricks and mortar” style: it pays attention to the vivid details of the history, to the key actors and to the built landscape of the city. The second is what one might call the “bells and whistles” style. It devotes itself to the symbols and culture of the city, seeking to show how those elements constitute the real history of a place. Harvey Graff’s new book can definitely be placed in the “bells and whistles” category for it is not so much a history of Dallas as it is a history of the way Dallas thinks of itself, as seen through the eyes of elite figures and historians of the city.

For many years a member of the faculty at the University of Texas at Dallas, Graff made important contributions to the historiography of the city as well as to its dissemination. He organized seminars on the city, gave countless speeches to various groups, wrote brochures on key elements and features of Dallas, and, according to his account, he produced students who wrote a number of important papers and thesis about the city.

But until now he never actually wrote a full and lengthy treatise on Dallas. And, as he states in the introduction, this was not an easy book to write. Nor is it an easy book to read and to understand.

If you want some of your bricks and mortars about the city they are here, scattered throughout in a collection of diagrams and appendices that will be invaluable to other researchers. But most of all Graff wants to leave the reader with the sense that Dallas is
not the city that its leading figures believe it to be—a city of great dreams, of progress, created by an incessant growth machine, at the crossroads of America, neither West nor South. For every claim that residents make about their city, Graff is willing to dispute that claim: the city is not what people think it is, he says, but rather is just the opposite. There is a great deal of material which he digests and employs in this discursive treatment, including a number of the seminal writings about cities by urban theorists. Graff uses this material to provide a varied set of interpretations of Dallas, on the ambitions of its leaders as well as the sense that leading figures believe the city has no history, that it is always just on the edge of greatness. Indeed, he takes on this claim directly by arguing as an historian that it must have a history, but he never fully and completely conveys what the central and driving elements of that history might be and of, how, in particular, Dallas is unique and singular rather than just like every other settlement on the frontier.

University of Illinois at Chicago

Anthony M. Orum


Weather Matters is an ambitious, richly illustrated survey of attention to weather in the United States since the turn of the twentieth century. It emphasizes the aims of signal individuals and institutions, their grand and trivial pursuits, common tongues, diverse visions and sensations. It leaves no doubt that, in fact, weather matters and for more reasons and in more ways than a casual observer might suppose.

As the endnotes detail, nearly every subtopic already has its own bibliography. Relevant scholarship has spewed from yet narrower social, artistic, or scientific stovepipes. There is a literature of forecasting (marine, mountain, plain . . .), of cloudscape and of measurement gizmos, of skies that are fair or foul and everything in between. Each of these traditions, in turn, has its favored sub-subtopics and media through which they are traced: academic monographs, office directives, popular lore, poetry, prose, visual and happening arts among schools, farms, Scout troops, jokes and “firsts,” museums, insurers . . . a huge array of broadcast, plastic, and print media, each with its own signal moments, hopes, and fears. The book is valuable for assembling such a huge range of ways that weather figures in all of these respects and therefore, too, material, social, and spiritual legacies that they afford. This is American Studies stuff.

The project has a pedigree that should be familiar to Americanists. It is part of the impressive series, “Culture America,” edited by American Studies and Art History stalwarts, Karal Ann Marling and Erika Doss. The author, Bernard Mergen, for decades has been an influential professor of American Studies at George Washington University as well as Senior Editor of American Studies International, which was absorbed by this journal in 2005. Through ASI, he helped blaze a trail that has only recently become a busy jetway in the field. Prior publications of his own—including several volumes on “play and play things” and the definitive Snow in America—foreshadow the attention to detail and the mode of synthesis that pervade Weather Matters. Nearly every person who is mentioned earns a thumbnail biography, and his or her significance is related to a playful, even if solemn, bridge between order and chaos in the sky, and of fear and wonder among those who give it attention.

A reader would be hard-pressed to imagine any subject—no matter how remotely connected to rain or shine—that escapes Mergen’s attention. My favorite section of the book is also the most personal: his account of an eight-day “Tempest Tour” in 2003, chas-
ing tornadoes with a professional guide, straight out of central casting. Imagine David Foster Wallace crafting “A Supposedly Fun Thing” with a kindly drill sergeant at his side. The humor could be mistaken for silly or glib, only because it is drier than most anything going on outside.

Weather Matters remains tough to categorize itself. Readers should be grateful that the book does not aim for exhaustive coverage, but the criteria used in selecting some sources or whole categories of them and ignoring others is difficult to discern, much less defend. Likewise, readers may appreciate an organization that avoids strict chronology, but the reason one discussion precedes another is left unclear. If topics or cases were engaged in an order that better clarified their significance for Americans or pointed arguments about them, I think the book would be even more valuable. But as is, Mergen has assembled an impressive riff on a century of American riffs on the weather.

The Coastal Institute

Richard P. Horwitz


In Motoring, the prolific authors John Jakle and Keith Sculle shift gears in their study of the historical landscapes of automobility, moving away from specific aspects of the commercial roadside towards a broad exploration of how roads and elements of the roadside shaped, and in turn were shaped by, Americans’ experiences of driving. They define motoring as the practice of driving for pleasure, and identify this practice as being located at the intersection of private enterprise, government, and the desires of ordinary automobile users. Jakle and Sculle argue that ordinary Americans’ motoring experiences need to be better understood because “touring and the delights of visual landscape encounter grounded America’s infatuation with a motorized transport system.” (5)

Motoring is not as tightly focused as the authors’ previous books on roadside landscapes, but this is not surprising given the complexity of the subject being addressed. Half the chapters focus on roads, and show how the experience of motoring was transformed by the transition from the improved wagon roads of the 1910s and ‘named highways’ of the 1920s to the scenic parkways of the 1930s and limited access highways of the postwar years. These chapters outline the diverse ways that American roads have been planned and constructed, and Jakle and Sculle pay special attention to how different types of roads molded motorists’ experiences of the landscapes they traversed. For example, the “highway hypnosis” associated with safer, smoother, faster travel along highly standardized and regulated highways could only have come about with the advent of the interstate system. (159)

The chapters on roads are interspersed with chapters that address a wide assortment of topics, including car dealerships, garages, tourist attractions, convenience stores, and two oft-overlooked modes of automobility: long-haul trucking and interstate bus travel. These ‘detours’ emphasize the important role that small and medium sized businesses played in shaping the motoring experience. However, because these chapters are scattered amongst the ones about roads, but not directly tied to them, they distract from the book’s most coherent narrative. The chapter “Motoring by Truck” seems especially out of place. Even its title suggests a contradiction in terms, given that the authors define motoring as driving for pleasure. Trucking undoubtedly played a key role in shaping the American highway network, but here Jakle and Sculle provide more of a thumbnail history of the trucking industry than an examination of how the intermingling of pleasure travellers and commercial truck traffic affected the popular motoring experience.
Motoring is full of interesting photos, editorial cartoons, and maps—there are images on almost every other page. Although somewhat uneven, it belongs in the library of anyone—generalist or specialist—who is interested in the history of American automobility. Motoring also merits serious consideration as a textbook for undergraduate courses on car culture and mass culture, so long as students are provided signposts to help make sense of the ‘detours’ Jakle and Sculle take in their otherwise cogent study of pleasure driving in America.

Queen’s University (Canada)  Ben Bradley


We sit in the dark, gazing at actors on a silver screen, and see . . . what? Adventure, heroism, despair, anguish, triumph, failure—certainly, that and much more. We also see our concerns and anxieties—threatened masculinity, gender and racial inequality, political decay, social disorder, and economic chaos. Films are our personal mirrors, often reflecting our dreams and nightmares, hopes and fears. All-Stars & Movie Stars, a collection of essays on sport films, provides ample evidence that sport films are not a class apart, that if as a body they do not quite rise to the level of a genre, they are nonetheless films that tell us a great deal about our society and culture—as well as about ourselves.

As with all such collections, the quality of the essays varies in terms of research and writing, but as a whole they treat sport films as significant cultural documents. Throughout there is an attempt to fuse academic concerns with race, class, and gender with traditional sport films and documentaries. Dayna B. Daniels, for example, explores misogyny and the treatment of women in sport films, Pellom McDaniels III focuses on the treatment of African Americans in baseball films, Ron Briley shows the racial politics inherent in Hoosiers, and John Hughson examines the social context of The Loneliness of the Long Distance Runner. Of course a number of other essays also address these themes, including ones by Victoria Elmwood and Clay Motley that discuss the class, racial, and gender implications of Rocky. At times the essays verge on suggesting that sport films are about everything but sports. Indeed, in a delightful essay Latham Hunter demonstrates how The Natural can be used to introduce students to the field of cultural studies.

As a whole, the essays seem directed toward history and cultural studies scholars and students. Most do not address specifically film studies issues. A full discussion of sports films as a separate genre or subgenre would have been a welcomed addition. Nor are a number of subjects of interest to sport historians addressed. How, for instance, have sport films influenced and shaped how we regard athletes and how the games are played. In an essay on televised golf as narrative, Harper Cossar discusses how television dictates how we watch the game, but there is no discussion of how the game has fundamentally changed to meet the demands of television. Similarly, basketball, football, baseball, boxing, and a number of other sports have altered their rules and tempo to suit the demands of television.

All-Star & Movie Star is highly suggestive. It demonstrates that sports films are rich documents, that they offer much for scholars of film, television, cultural studies, sport, and history. It also signals a need for more systematic studies, such as Dan Streible’s Fight Pictures: A History of Boxing and Early Cinema (2008).

Purdue University  Randy Roberts
Pero Dagbovie has made a vital study of black American intellectual life and black professional historians. We owe him a debt of gratitude for this monograph, which sheds light on two of the most influential black historians prior to 1950—Carter G. Woodson and Lorenzo J. Greene. Thematically there are several strands running through Dagbovie’s narrative—mentor and student, movement leader and disciple, political polemicist and historical propagandist, and tireless commitment to scholarship. Also central to this book is how difficult it was for black scholars to break the phalanx of the all-white historical profession and academic establishment before the civil rights era. Dagbovie increases our knowledge by telling the remarkable story of how a small group of black academically trained historians along with black school teachers, especially black women teachers, supported the democratic social insurgency of black Americans by teaching and uncovering the history of black Americans as a force for self-empowerment, social change and academic understanding. The early history of the black history movement in which Woodson and Greene were key actors surely would have brought approving nods from the Italian Marxist theorist, Antonio Gramsci, as models of organic intellectuals in breaking down the intellectual and cultural hegemony of whiteness in American history.

This story is intriguing because the relationship between the senior Woodson and the junior Greene was fraught with financial pressures, at times personal animosities, Woodson’s insufferable idiosyncrasies, institutional limitations, and individual frustrations. Remarkably, the taut relationship between these two scholars never got in the way of each of their unwavering commitment to research, writing, and spreading black history. And this is the side of the story of the black history movement where Dagbovie’s book shines.

While Dagbovie’s book adds to our knowledge there is one large hole that one wishes the author might have taken more time to fill. My chief criticism of Dagbovie’s book is the lack of philosophical exploration of both Woodson and Greene’s views on history. Both of these men were in the contributionist era of writing black history, however, the author never quite explains fully enough how these respective scholars thought about the meaning of their prodigious scholarship. This is especially true in chapter 3 where the author thinly analyzes one of Woodson’s most important and popular books *The Mis-Education of the Negro*. It would have been more rewarding if Dagbovie had put more time into elaborating on their respective context in light of their PhD mentors and how they fit into the American historical professional as each man entered the discipline and matured as scholars. The varying schools of thought and influence about studying and writing history from the early to mid 20th century—empirical, Marxists, and consensus schools—would have illumined readers further and brought to light why the insurgency of the black history movement was so crucial in forcing the American historical professional to be more fully inclusive of all American people. While this aspect of the book is disappointing, credit is due Dagbovie for helping us understand the significance of these two luminary historians in relationship to one another.

University of Kansas

Randal Maurice Jelks
In 1914, a Chinese Hawaiian baseball team not only beat a squad from Occidental College, but also taunted the umpire and their opponents, and then enjoyed a banquet in Los Angeles’s Chinatown. This small incident illustrates a larger dynamic elucidated in The Athletic Crusade. After baseball’s introduction by Christian missionaries, plantation owners had promoted the sport among Chinese, Portuguese, Japanese, Filipino, and Korean workers to instill teamwork and discipline. Yet in the context of anti-Chinese racism in Hawaii and the mainland, the athletes employed baseball to resist an American ideology rooted in religious and racial superiority. In multiple contexts around the globe, Gerald Gems argues that “sport became a political tool of accommodation or resistance to the dominant power or a means to greater nationalistic identity” (150).

Gems first investigates China and Japan, where American cultural imperialism failed to take firm root. By 1910, the YMCA had staged a national athletic championship in Nanking. But the YMCA rarely reached the rural peasantry, and resentment of white racism hindered the spread of American sport. As in Japan, nationalism trumped a wholesale adoption of Western sport. The Japanese embraced baseball, of course, but used it to bolster national pride and reject white assumptions of cultural superiority. Baseball triumphs reflected Japan’s rising status within Asia, and the maintenance of the bushido code suggested an adaptation of Western sport to Japanese ends.

Given the longstanding presence of United States military and business interests, American sport infiltrated the Philippines and Hawaii. “Baseball has done more to ‘civilize’ Filipinos than anything else,” bragged General Franklin Bell, commander of U.S. forces in Manila (49). Hawaiian plantations and canneries supplied workers with sports equipment and facilities. Yet native people forged national identities through sport. Filipinos favored Tagalog over English, Catholicism over Protestantism, basketball over baseball. Hawaiians not only revived traditional practices such as canoe racing, but also exported cultural practices such as surfing.

Gems further explores different adaptations of sport within Latin America. In annexed and occupied Puerto Rico, sport provided not only a connection to the United States, but also a forum for national self-identification. In Fidel Castro’s Cuba, by contrast, baseball embodied resistance to the United States. There the sport “has nurtured a nationalistic spirit, reconstructed a fragmented culture, exhibited machismo in times of oppression, and restored dignity and pride to the Cuban people” (98).

One wishes Gems applied his nuanced understanding of sport’s political applications to the larger process of empire. In his telling, racism and exploitation seem an exclusive province of villainous Americans, and all forms of anti-colonial adaptation or resistance deserve equal commendation. The American Crusade nevertheless lends an important contribution to our understanding of the international ramifications of American sports.


In Stolen Bases Professor Jennifer Ring explores the question of exclusion of women from baseball, historically and to the present in the United States. Other countries seem to be farther ahead in supporting women’s baseball as acknowledged by Ring in her concluding chapter so her focus remains on the United States. While this is a not a unique
question that Dr. Ring examines it is one that still needs more attention because it is more complex than simply saying it is because the opportunities do not exist beyond Little League for most girls. Dr. Ring explores all the various dimensions of this question to determine why women have played baseball from its earliest days and yet are basically excluded from the game as much as possible.

By beginning with the early history of baseball Dr. Ring points out that baseball was never an exclusively all-male game but that achievements of bloomer teams, of blondes and brunettes etc. . . . have been excluded from the telling of the history. This lack of inclusion has created a false sense that women never played and therefore they do not need to play now. After all, there is softball for girls though softball was not originally created for that purpose. Ring says that baseball’s growth paralleled the development of America and her growing identity which is what turned the game in to a part of the white male dominance of American culture.

Once baseball’s identity had been created it was easy to maintain the myth that women did not play and that softball was more suited to women’s abilities. This idea was taken further in the story of baseball’s origins. A. G. Spalding and others desperately tried to separate the American game from any English games such as rounders because they were considered less masculine and non-American. Dr. Ring tells this story through the life of Spalding and his relationship with his mother and father.

Softball’s invention further excluded women because now there was an alternative. A new game was created to answer the critics and the cries for change. It came along at a time when indoor sports like basketball were gaining in popularity for girls. With women being more or less confined to playing softball Ring argues this paralleled a similar movement in society to keep women contained and controlled. It also seemed to follow developing concerns about race and class, again issues used in America to keep people separated.

Dr. Ring raises some fascinating issues and questions through her text. She explores them in some detail with good solid research and ends by concluding that nothing will change until there is a major goal for women to shoot for. As a result, her daughter Lily and others who play today will continue to struggle to get the opportunity and recognition they deserve.

Leslie Heaphy


*Playing America’s Game* begins with the author introducing us to why he has an interest in this topic and what makes him qualified to pursue this line of study. After giving us this brief introduction Dr. Burgos then goes on to explain for the reader where he sees this study fitting in the literature about America’s National Pastime. While to some this may seem too much like what you find in a dissertation it is helpful to those not as familiar with the materials.

Dr. Burgos uses this text to explain how Latino’s enjoy a unique place in baseball history, fitting neither into the area of inclusion or exclusion easily. He argues that has been the trend of much of the literature in discussing Latino players as either white or black but that is too simple. Dr. Burgos says that they are much more “central actors in the negotiation of the color line” (5) and reveal a great deal about the evolution of racial attitudes in this country. How did these young men come to be allowed to play in the
Major Leagues and also the Negro Leagues? Were they simply able to play based solely on their skin color or as Dr. Burgos argues was it more complicated?

Beginning with baseball in the 19th century readers are taken through the various changes in baseball that affected who was able to play and under what rules. In the early days baseball lacked organization and economic clout and so players moved about easily such as Esteban Bellan. With the introduction of a reserve clause and more organization a color line developed to help white players exercise more control over who played the game.

The question of Latino players and where they fit in this picture really entered the scene by the 1890s and the Spanish American War when interactions between the United States and Cuba increased. Vincent Nava becomes the first figure to really introduce the question to the American public about where Latino players fit. Dr. Burgos gives detailed look into how Nava was viewed by the press and public. Though no one seemed to call for Nava’s exclusion from the game he was playing at the same time that African Americans were forced to form their own teams like the Cuban Giants and even their own leagues. From here Dr. Burgos goes on to examine what happened to Latino players in both arenas and how their playing time pushed the boundaries of racial exclusion.

With excellent primary and secondary sources Dr. Burgos weaves a story that raises more questions than at times can be answered in one text. He challenges prevailing views about race in America and asks us to reconsider the role of Latinos in America’s game. Through his extensive notes and bibliography researchers can pursue this story further and see that he did create a story but has brought out pieces of the story that have been overlooked or been seen as simply back or white and not brown.

Kent State University Stark Campus

Leslie Heaphy


With considerable help from taxpayers, North American sports teams have prompted investment in new ballpark construction at a record pace over the last twenty years. Michael Ian Borer’s Faithful to Fenway explores one sports facility that is an anomaly to this trend.

His text offers a compelling overview of what Fenway Park means to Bostonians and others. He brings thick description to his analysis, unpacking how a broad range of constituencies attach meaning to America’s oldest Major League ballpark. Borer’s central thesis is that meaning is culturally constructed and a highly fluid process that yields a far from uniform outcome.

He creates a four-part “typology of cultural frames” to isolate the range of opinions individuals have about the future of Fenway Park. (137) Those in the “orthodox” category advocate full preservation, the most popular “conservative” frame supports prudent, well reasoned renovation, the “reform” category prefers a modern Fenway-style replica, while the “radical” frame calls for a modern ballpark that is a complete break from the original Fenway design. (137)

Borer succeeds on many levels as he examines what this ballpark means to a community that is so passionate about it that some individuals have gone as far as to release the ashes of deceased loved ones onto the field. Early in the text, he pushes the theoretical further than I would like, inserting sociology, anthropology, and other disciplines into the analysis continuously. Subsequently, he backs away from routinely connecting each
thought to a mode of scholarship, and the analysis improves as this more comfortable balance unfolds.

He chronicles an organization named Save Fenway Park!, explaining how their passion was instrumental keeping preservation efforts alive when team officials were viscerally committed to replacing the historic ballpark. A change in management created an opportunity for the kind of preservation this organization supported, so Borer chronicles this process.

Borer admits that limited seating space allows the team “to continually raise ticket prices.” (168) However, he frequently gives team management the benefit of the doubt, backing off the critical throttle more than I would prefer. If not for the ability to turn the old ballpark’s mystique into a profit center, the team would likely abandon the venerable structure for a new one. Borer introduces “devotional consumerism” and “creative consumption” to explain how individuals connect to Fenway Park, two concepts which work to enrich team management in profound ways, though he tends to downplay that issue somewhat. (116) Red Sox President Larry Lucchino introduces the “Fenway Hippocratic Oath” as “do no harm,” yet, as someone who presided over the replacement of an aging ballpark in Baltimore, he has been driven by bottom-line profitability in both scenarios. (163)

Borer does a wonderful job of isolating individuals who have varied opinions about Fenway Park, including players, fans, and team management. However, his notion that Fenway is America’s most beloved ballpark might be contested in Chicago and elsewhere. The passion of Chicago’s Cubs fans, Pittsburgh’s Steeler nation, and Wisconsin’s Packer backers leads me to believe that the debate is partly about place but also driven by a bundle of other cultural factors. Fenway Park is a remarkable ballpark, but whether it is someone’s “favorite” depends on one’s perspective. Despite the potential for debate, Borer’s text is a solid achievement.

Pennsylvania State University Altoona

Robert Trumpbour


To mark its hundredth anniversary, Yale University Press commissioned this unabashedly celebratory history written by the noted bibliophile Nicholas Basbanes. Slight in size and breezily written, the book is organized into just four chapters, representing the tenure of each of the Press’s directors: George Parmley Day, class of 1897, who helped establish the Press and led it from 1908 to 1954 (“The Formative Years”); Chester Kerr, class of 1936, who oversaw its operations from 1954 to 1979 (“The Middle Years”); John Ryden, who ran the Press from 1979 until 2003 (“Enriching the Mix”); and John Donatich, who succeeded him (2003 - : “A Press in Transition”).

Yale is a distinguished and thriving publishing house, the nation’s largest books-only—based university press, with a rich history. Today YUP publishes more than 300 new titles annually, and sales exceed $35 million. It has published hundreds of world-class authors from Gore Vidal, Edmund Morgan, and Jaroslav Pelikan to E. H. Gombrich, Kai Erikson, and Adrienne Rich.

Basbanes relates some fascinating anecdotes, among them the events that preceded publication of Eugene O’Neill’s “Long Day’s Journey into Night” (1956) and those that followed publication of Eugene V. Rostow’s A National Policy for the Oil Industry (1948), as well as the firestorm surrounding publication of The Vinland Map and the Tartar Relation (1965). But Basbanes often wanders off into topics that relate only tangentially to
YUP (for example, the Ithaka Report; a lengthy discussion of libraries; the definition of a monograph). In a book of just 198 small and open pages these digressions are especially jarring in light of the near-absence of whole decades of YUP’s history. Nonetheless, some important moments such as the decision to open a London office to publish art books, which quickly became a cash cow for the Press, and the establishment of the Annals of Communism series and of Yale Younger Poets do get their due. And there are recitations of best-sellers and of some of the Press’s many distinguished books.

Surprisingly, there is no appendix listing Yale’s winners of the Pulitzer Prize, Bancroft Prize, National Book Award, and other honors. Nor is there an index, a decision that seems inexplicable. So, too, are some other book-making decisions. The volume is “perfect” bound—glued, not sewn; it is adorned with plain white end leaves; and it is wrapped in paper-on-board binding rather than cloth. These penny-pinching decisions run counter to the special centennial website, the publicity, the spare-no-expense star-studded conference, and the other entirely appropriate celebrations of YUP’s anniversary.

Basbanes notes that the University’s motto is lux et veritas—light and truth—“words that have special relevance to a publishing enterprise whose goal is to create an enduring world of letters.” (xiii) Despite changes that the digital revolution has visited upon publishers of music, newspapers, magazines, and books, the history and commitment outlined in A World of Letters inspire confidence that Yale University Press will enjoy a second century marked not merely by endurance but by excellence.

Director, University of North Carolina Press
Kate Douglas Torrey


Historians agree that the turn of the last century represented a nadir in southern race relations. African Americans were disfranchised in state after state, likewise suffering segregation and legally sanctioned discrimination, violence in the form of “whitewashing” and lynching, the prevalence of the convict lease system, widespreadpeonage, and the ubiquitous crop lien system. The triumphs of a generation of Democratic demagogues made it difficult for other whites—Democratic moderates, Republicans, or Populists—to present alternatives to the relentless persecution of blacks.

Yet members of these groups did present what historian C. Vann Woodward identified in The Strange Career of Jim Crow (1955 and subsequent editions) as “Forgotten Alternatives.” One of the latter was paternalistically racist, based upon several considerations: (1) acceptance that the Civil War and Reconstruction had given African Americans a new legal status; (2) a sense of responsibility for former slaves; (3) the hope that black voters could help to establish stable post-war governments; and (4) the expectation that none of the above would threaten existing racial hierarchies. These paternalists tended to be former Confederates; many of them were lawyers or judges. Commentators have often ignored the law’s impact upon patrician thought. But with the publication of Brent Aucoin’s A Rift in the Clouds it is possible to begin to view the New South’s conservative reformers through the prism of law.

Aucoin has written an insightful book analyzing the careers of three federal judges: Jacob Trieber (Eastern District, Arkansas, 1900-1927), Emory Speer (Southern District, Georgia, 1885-1918), and Thomas Goode Jones (Middle District, Alabama, 1901-1914). Two of these (Jones and Speer) were ex-Confederates; Trieber and Speer were Republicans, while Jones was a lifelong Democrat. All three were celebrated (or reviled) for fighting peonage, mob violence, and denials of due process. In doing so they relied upon bold
applications of civil rights laws and the Civil War amendments to the Constitution—at a time when the U.S. Supreme Court was ignoring the rights of African Americans and turning the 14th Amendment in particular into a bastion of defense for corporations.

Aucoin’s judges, however, went against the trend, attempting to expand constitutional prohibitions against lynching, unreasonable prosecution, and unjust imprisonment. The three had their greatest (if hard-fought and limited) successes in combating peonage. Each of the judges has attracted the attention of scholars; but Aucoin places them in context, showing that they were willing to exchange news, advice, and encouragement. Modestly but persuasively, he ascribes their behavior to the convergence of personal, religious, and professional factors. This reviewer wishes he had spent more time on the values and thought processes inculcated by the practice of law—on the values evident, for example, in Alabama’s 1887 code of legal ethics, authored by Jones. But this is a minor quibble, perhaps a matter for Aucoin’s future works. For the present he has given us an exciting glimpse into what Carl Degler has called the “Other South,” in the form of three judges whose opinions anticipated, to some extent, the constitutional interpretations made by Judge Frank M. Johnson and other heroes of the Civil Rights era.

University of Alabama

Paul M. Pruitt, Jr.


Although rising fuel prices may give credence to recent reports of runaway road rage, two new books suggest that driver incivility—both perceived and real—has plagued our nation’s roads and highways ever since Americans first traveled them. David Blanke’s Hell on Wheels examines how America’s torrid love affair with the automobile complicated notions of risk and freedom during the first half of the twentieth century. Jeremy Packer’s Mobility Without Mayhem takes up the story following World War II and argues that traffic enforcement has long sought to eliminate perceived social threats by extending models of good citizenship onto the road. Despite differing disciplinary footings, both studies take seriously sociologist Ulrich Beck’s claims about the centrality of risk in western modernity. Similarly, both contribute to the growing field of automobility studies that seek to loosen our understanding of the automobile’s complex sociocultural impact from its usual moorings in the histories of technology and economics.

Blanke brings his historian’s tool kit to bear on a remarkable breadth of sources ranging from safety studies to cartoons. He shows us that Americans have worried about safety since the dawn of the auto age and have long worked to craft effective traffic laws. Early debates concerning regulation reveal, however, that our love affair with the car complicated enforcement. Blanke demonstrates that the automobile’s suburban promise, its Progressive appeal, and its sheer kinetic thrills left us so smitten that we simply could not stand to regulate what, by the 1920s, had clearly become an unacceptably dangerous aspect of daily life. Progressives initially blamed traffic fatalities on inferior drivers bereft of intelligence and civic virtue. Later, blame shifted to the faulty roads, laws, and equipment that made accidents inevitable. Despite declining fatalities, today’s proliferation of roadside memorials reminds us that danger is never far. Still, our lack of empathy for accident victims and our unwillingness to obey the very traffic laws we endorse indicates, Blanke concludes, that we are still blinded by our love for the car.
Packer picks up the story by investigating how Americans have reconciled safety demands with thrill seeking in the years since World War II. Grounded in communication studies, Packer trades statistics for media representations of automobility wherein he finds evidence of what Michelle Foucault termed “correct training.” When post-war automobility threatened social norms, Packer shows us, state and business interests rushed in to maintain the status quo. Popular films, for example, encouraged women to think of campgrounds as extensions of their suburban domestic spaces rather than as nomadic alternatives. Authorities demonized hitchhiking because it discouraged car ownership and, consequently, subverted capitalist production. Packer discusses the cultural construction of outlaw bikers and renegade truckers in similar terms. Ultimately, he concludes, our willingness to tolerate over-regulation of perceived automotive deviance has rendered us all vulnerable to invasive surveillance in this post-9/11 era of racial profiling and traffic-light cameras.

Despite their topical similarities, these books are very different in method and execution. *Hell on Wheels* is most remarkable for Blanke’s impressive synthesis of primary materials. He provides valuable statistics on automobile use and accidents prior to 1940 (especially in chapter 2); insightful first-hand accounts by drivers, pedestrians, and police; and colorful vignettes on topics ranging from car camping to the bizarre psychological testing of cab drivers. Blanke’s evidentiary thoroughness occasionally disrupts his narrative, but overall his writing is strong and his arguments are convincing. Despite good discussions of gender and class difference, readers will expect more here about the influence of racial attitudes on the social construction of risk. Given the relative inaccessibility of automobiles to black Americans during this period, one must wonder how all-encompassing America’s love affair with the car really was.

*Mobility Without Mayhem* presents itself as a “broad cultural history” of automobility, but historians will be frustrated by Packer’s method. Foucault is very present in this “genealogy of the power/knowledge relationships that determined how to organize and regulate different population’s access to and use of automobility” (3). We hear very little though from those populations themselves. Packer looks almost exclusively to songs, advertisements, films, and other mass media to reconstruct American notions of acceptable automobility leaving the reader to wonder what sense the hitchhikers, motorcyclists, and truck drivers made of their own behaviors. This book is richly illustrated and begins important conversations about the cultural impact of citizens band (CB) radio and the prickly relationship between Cadillacs and black motorists. Unfortunately these contributions may be lost to readers thwarted by this book’s cumbersome prose and poor editing. And although Blanke helps us reduce automotive risk by showing how it has been previously obscured by our love for cars, Packer leaves us without alternatives amid the terrifying possibilities of a surveillance state born of automotive regulation. As our country succumbs to its longstanding petroleum dependencies, it seems that alternatives are exactly what we need and precisely why automobility studies stand to make important contributions across disciplines.

Temple University Seth C. Bruggeman


Peter Norton’s *Fighting Traffic* examines how automotive interests in the 1920s redirected public policy concerning streets. It devotes meticulous attention to the public
safety crisis created by traffic, and to the rhetorical and political strategies used to resolve this crisis on behalf of “organized motordom.”

The motor age dawns later in Norton’s account than in some previous studies. The leading work on early urban motoring, Clay McShane’s *Down the Asphalt Path* (1994), described a changing public perception of streets in the decades around the turn of the twentieth century. “By 1910, most motorists had conceded urban crosswalks to pedestrians and most adult pedestrians had conceded the middle of the block to cars.” (187)

Not so fast, Norton seems to caution us: the automobile’s dominance was far from complete. “… Before 1920 American pedestrians crossed streets wherever they wished, walked in them, and let their children play in them.” (70) But the rising numbers of vehicles struck and killed thousands of pedestrians, provoking outrage. Police, judges and journalists initially blamed motorists and tried to force them to conform to nineteenth-century street customs. Traffic deaths continued and congestion worsened.

By 1923, automotive interests feared the situation was reaching a crisis. Local safety councils were giving cars a bad name by blaming speeders for killing children. Hostility to speed was so intense that Cincinnatians voted on whether to make motorists install devices that would shut off their engines at 25 m.p.h. Transit companies’ publicity portrayed automobiles as the cause of congestion and trolleys as the more efficient solution. As congestion worsened, automobile manufacturers worried that the urban market might be getting saturated.

The events of 1924 marked a turning point. U.S. Commerce Secretary Herbert Hoover formed a National Conference on Street and Highway Safety, dominated by automobile interests, that drafted an influential model traffic ordinance. The model ordinance “overturned pedestrians’ ancient legal supremacy in the streets,” and required them to cross only at crosswalks or at least yield to traffic when they crossed elsewhere. (192) Organized motordom demanded more street “floor space” to serve more cars.

Automotive propaganda now presented motoring as an individual liberty, not to be suppressed in the name of efficiency. It blamed “reckless pedestrians” for their own deaths. Finally, under President Hoover, the government agreed that the way to fight traffic accidents was to build safer highways.

Most of the book consists of topical chapters considering different social groups’ perspectives on street use. Norton does a fine job of tracing the philosophical underpinnings of each perspective. Perhaps the best chapter is a richly detailed examination of the public response to traffic fatalities.

The emphasis on Hoover’s conference appears exaggerated. The traffic ordinance does not seem radically different from previous attempts at controlling pedestrians, and its effect is questionable.

The book is based on copious research, but its depth comes at the expense of breadth. We learn a lot about the 1920s and little about the historical background. Norton hesitates to explain how his work modifies previous scholars’ findings. By virtually ignoring the earlier redefinition of street space described by McShane, he misses an opportunity to make a greater mark on the literature. It will be up to other scholars to decide how to synthesize these two interpretations of the dawn of the motor age.

University of Connecticut

Peter C. Baldwin
Colin Grant’s new biography of Marcus Mosiah Garvey is a dyspeptic view of history’s most famous black nationalist, written with considerable literary flair and marred by occasional misstatements, some questionable historical judgments, and an overwhelming reliance on the accounts of Garvey’s many enemies in the United States government and at large. Grant shows us a surprisingly negative portrait of the great black nationalist as a conservative and even a reactionary, who infamously met with the leader of the KKK and less famously supported employers over labor unions, acquiesced to Jim Crow, and claimed to have invented fascism. The book focuses on Garvey’s two marriages, his organizational struggles, and his failed business venture, the Black Star Line, the enterprise that landed him in the penitentiary and got him expelled from the United States.

The intentionally provocative and crass title of the book is an irreverent and unfortunate choice; a reference to one of Garvey’s best known and most often criticized qualities, his taste for pomp and circumstance. By focusing on the hat, the author seems to have missed Garvey’s head. According to Grant, “anyone with common sense” would agree with Du Bois about the utter futility of Garvey’s program (366). The author seldom takes Garvey seriously as a thinker and hardly explores his ideas or his voluminous writings and speeches. Similarly, in contrast to the best traditions of social history, Grant ignores Garvey’s followers, telling us virtually nothing about who was attracted to Garvey and why. Indeed, his thesis is precisely that Garveyites’ bond with their leader “was not rational; it was emotional,” (323). Other authors have done a better job of investigating both Garvey’s ideas and the many rational reasons why millions of black people in fact chose to follow him.

Perhaps Grant’s failure to explore such issues is a result of his unfounded and unfootnoted belief that “slavery had not been the best preparation for industrial, commercial and intellectual endeavour: it induced a moral torpor, and though the spell had been broken it might take generations before the curse was lifted. Garvey understood this and the near-unrealisable desire to be just as good as the white man that risked rendering the black man a mere mimic of the real thing.” (194). Such a claim ignores the vast literature on slavery, slave resistance, enslaved commercial activity and enslaved creativity, while advancing a suspect notion of “moral torpor.” Here and elsewhere, Grant, a journalist with the BBC, evinces a lack of familiarity with relevant historical background literature, although he makes frequent use of the multi-volume Garvey Papers. “Apart from the magnificent churches,” Grant asserts, dubiously, “there was no entrée to grandeur in Negro life;” (184), ignoring African American fraternal orders, spirituals, jazz, blues, poetry, and letters, let alone the more prosaic experience of grandeur in Harlem nightclubs or 1920s movie palaces.

Other errors are less significant but still jarring: the author frequently refers to W.E.B. Du Bois as “William Du Bois,” and claims that Freemason Prince Hall, who died in 1807, was the founder of the Shriners, when that order’s white and black branches were actually founded in 1872 and 1893, respectively.

Grant’s work is a better guide to Garvey’s times than to Garvey himself, and it contains long and well-crafted, occasionally lyrical, passages on Garvey’s contemporaries and on the era as a whole. Yet even at the level of craft, this work shows numerous examples of repetition and at times follows narrative eddies that double back upon themselves or turn into dead ends.
In sum, the book provides an entertaining introduction to Marcus Garvey’s rise, struggles, and fall, but readers who want to discover why he held such appeal to so many will have to go beyond the hat.

University of Kansas

Jacob S. Dorman


The idea of Black women’s bodies in motion on stage in the early twentieth century may conjure a host of images: the minstrel performer, the chorus line girl, the cabaret singer, and the one-woman showmanship of Josephine Baker, Florence Mills, and Ada Overton Walker. A relationship between these Black women’s bodies, economic capital, as well as the transatlantic circulation of culture that enabled these performative images to come to fruition, is the subject of Jayna Brown’s Babylon Girls: Black Women Performers and the Shaping of the Modern. Black female performance in the United States, the Pacific, and Europe constitute Brown’s “Babylon girls,” that is, the audacious well-known and nameless Black women of the stage. These women, she argues, used dance as a “creative response to shared and individual experiences of dislocation and relocation,” while at the same time negotiating geographical spaces for which they might begin to “call home.” (16) The book’s arguments engage with the experience of exile for these women and the contradictory aesthetic of luxury, sensuality, vice, and corruption that marked 20th century variety shows. More than a cultural history and finely-formulated theoretical analysis of the well-known names of Black female performance, Brown demonstrates how lesser-known performers, such as Belle Davis, Stella Wiley, and Valaida Snow employed a complex mixture of racial mimicry, Black expressive culture, and Black dance vocabularies to communicate a gendered and diasporic representation of Blackness. As this groundbreaking book illustrates, Black women performers are not exceptions to or peripheral to the story of citizenship and nation making in these multiple geographic sites; they are central to the story of 20th century performance and to understanding the underlying grammars of spectacle.

Brown begins with a discussion of children in “picaniny choruses.” For audiences, the young bodies in picaniny choruses were nostalgic reminders of folk consciousness and they were objects used to fulfill colonialist cravings for racialized performance. This dual mixture of bodies for entertainment, and bodies as a restorative narrative, not only referred to picaniny choruses, but also referred to the performances of the top billing Black women such as Bell Davis and Ida Forsyne. The latter serves as Brown’s example of how Black female performers exercised conscious performance strategies even within the seemingly limiting genre of minstrelsy. Brown acknowledges and historicizes the opinions of critics, especially the Black intelligentsia, who viewed Forsyne’s Topsy performance as “the quintessential symbol of black artistic denigration and humiliation.” (76) Critics notwithstanding, Brown argues that Forsyne’s “breathtaking act references historical memory” (61) and her “performance of the contortions of time” (89) allowed her to “transform herself in the trappings of colonial wealth,” thereby “reclaiming her body.” (91)

Babylon Girls departs from (although it returns to) the “take me back” plantation performances to analyze the burlesque inspired and urban-themed performances of Dora Dean, Bell Davis, and Stella Wiley, and the chorus girls in Black revues such as Shuffle Along. Additional shows such as Oriental America, The Octoroons, and The Creole Show reveal how Orientalist fantasies of Asian Pacific Islander women were made possible by
way of light-skinned, Black women’s bodies. Audiences viewed colored chorus girls in a multiplicity of ways: as hopeful figures of migration, and as symbols of sexual depravity because of their light skin color, seemingly rootless, and un-married status. The book’s discussion of cross racial performance bears additional intellectual fruit, by pointing out how Black female performers such as Stella Wiley’s rendition of Irish Liz Leary, and the blackface performance of the white female vaudevillian May Irwin’s “Louisiana Lize,” represent racial crossing with commonalities and differences. Wiley’s Irish song and dance girl and Irwin’s tragic mulatta both addressed female autonomy, but “Black women’s acts also acknowledged the irony of Black women’s exclusion from national belonging, having been so recently literally belongings” (121).

The last chapter may seem to cover familiar ground with its discussion of Josephine Baker. Yet, Brown adds to the literature by demonstrating throughout that Baker was not a performative anomaly. Rather, Baker and other well-known performers were a part of a litany of Black female predecessors and contemporaries that used the transnational stage to enact expressive innovation. Further, Brown extends scholarship on the iconic performer by showing not only how Baker’s performances in France served as “a précis for French Negrophilia and primitivism,” (252) (a well known interpretation), but also how her performances meant to support the de Gaulle military resistance during World War II as she toured through the Middle East, Egypt, and Algiers. By the book’s conclusion, a reoccurring trope in the production and consumption of Black women’s bodies on stage is thus established: they signified race, gender, sexuality and class within multivalent constructs that reified, shaped, and in contradiction, challenged modern conceptualizations of nation.

*Babylon Girls* provides voluminous examples and contributes to cultural and performance studies, but two of its interventions read particularly fresh and timely for interdisciplinary work. The first is its exploration of imperialism and its theorization of Black feminine performance in sites besides the common suspects of the United States, England, and France. Brown takes us farther to interrogate Black performance in the Pacific (Shanghai) and a much broader span of Europe, including Germany, Hungry, Poland, and Russia. Two, Brown reminds the reader of a key component of doing scholarly work on performance and audience: all performances convey different meanings, even a repeated performance of the same narrative, because it is never acted out in the same way and is therefore never received and interpreted in the same way. This astute observation serves as a strong reminder and an interpretive strategy that leads to nuance and careful readings of stage performances and their audience.

The book’s lengthy outlines of scholarly procedure at the beginning of each chapter may read taxing to some readers, but the meaty arguments that follow make up for what appears as a commitment to providing the reader with a continual map of intent and content. Brown jumps from travelogue, to performance, to literature, to colonialism in *Babylon Girls* not in a linear fashion, but rather, in a circular way that allows for an organic weaving and building of interpretations of performance, reception, and their complex meanings. *Babylon Girls* does what it sets out to accomplish. The book shows how Black women performers in the first half of the twentieth century shaped the terms of spectacle inferred by their presence on the public stage. In addition, *Babylon Girls* illustrates the ways Black women performers questioned the grounds of the dominant gaze by positioning themselves as bodies in expressive motion, and as bodies in modern dissent, that dared to “gaze back.”

University of Iowa

Deborah Elizabeth Whaley
In *Performing Americanness*, Catherine Rottenberg argues through close readings of Nella Larsen, James Weldon Johnson, Abraham Cahan and Anzia Yezierska’s texts, that narratives of passing and assimilation offer a complex challenge to “hegemonic notions of Americanness” (4). She uses performativity to highlight how characters become intelligible in relation to dominant gender, class, and racialized “norms,” which they contest as they “cite and mime” them throughout the novels (6).

Rottenberg begins with Abraham Cahan’s character, David Levinsky, whose gender performance fails to live up to cultural ideals in Eastern Europe and to dominant understandings of masculinity in the U.S. She demonstrates how Levinsky “must attempt to approximate dominant (gender) norms” to be intelligible but “can never fully embody a specific norm once and for all” (26). This movement among conflicting social norms destabilizes gender categories and offers a radical critique of Americanness, according to Rottenberg. When Rottenberg is sensitive to these cultural conflicts, her analysis is contextualized and successful. However, Rottenberg’s focus on identification and desire rather than historical and political negotiation limits her theoretical and specific reading of race and ethnicity in the texts of Yezierska, Johnson, and Larsen.

For example, Rottenberg suggests that Jewish writers created characters who successfully identified and desired to be white to gain racial privilege, a strategy denied African American writers. Describing Adele Lindner as a new woman in *Arrogant Beggar*, she argues that “Jewishness, whiteness, and femaleness were being (re)configured as increasingly compatible with one another” (98). According to Rottenberg, this representation contrasts sharply with Nella Larsen’s depiction of Helga Crane in *Quicksand*, since “a black woman was always already oversexed, Helga can find no way of successfully fashioning herself as a new woman” (106). Rottenberg’s lack of historical grounding keeps her from seeing that Yezierska’s characters do not simply identify as white, and like Larsen, they too reject the dominant version of the new woman. In *Salome of the Tenements*, Yezierska exposes the racialized positioning of Sonya Vrunsky who is seen as oversexed and a prostitute from the perspective of white, upper class gentiles regardless of Sonya’s class position or unsuccessful intermarriage. Both Adele and Sonya offer subtle revisions of class and gender norms in Jewish cultural terms as well.

To examine the shifting and difficult history of race and ethnicity during the Progressive Era, Rottenberg needs to take into account the specific discourses of segregation as well as nativism and anti-immigration restriction. Her discussion of immigrant groups as “off-white” would be more substantive if she used Roger Daniels’ work to outline racialized discourses of foreignness, including the writings of 1924 law-makers who claimed America was being “diluted by a stream of alien blood” (*Guarding the Golden Door*, 55). Rottenberg could expand her analysis of the African American textual performance of race to include Jessie Fauset and others’ strategic distancing of their characters from foreigners because of this discourse, for example (Batker 71-88). If Rottenberg’s analysis of performativity used political context to build the contestatory discourses through which characters in these novels became intelligible, then her analysis would speak more carefully to the complexity of racial and ethnic affiliations during this turbulent time.
A few years ago, a polygraph examiner in Chicago recounted to me how one subject had beaten the test. After the suspect “passed” (the technical term is NDI, “no deception indicated”), the examiner, who was convinced that he was guilty of the crime, asked him how he had managed to outwit the machine. The subject, apparently more proud of his ruse than concerned to maintain his innocence, opened his shirt and revealed that his torso was wrapped in aluminum foil. That should have no effect on the results at all, the examiner explained, but he surmised that the subject’s utter confidence in his tactic enabled him to avoid the tell-tale bodily responses that indicate deception.

This little story demonstrates Ken Adler’s point in this informative study that the lie detector works mainly as a placebo does: its effectiveness owes less to what it can do than to what people think it can do. Hence polygraph tests are primarily effective for eliciting confessions, which subjects often offer when they become convinced that the machine has caught them dead to rights. One problem is that some subjects come to credit the machine’s powers above their own memories and make false confessions. The same polygraph examiner told me of a case where, during the test, he became convinced of a subject’s innocence while she became convinced of her guilt, and it took him several hours of further testing and conversation before he managed to get her to withdraw her confession.

Adler has produced a meticulous history of lie detection, focusing especially on its birth and florescence between the 1920s and 1940s. It is told mainly through the stories of its central figures. Hovering above it all is August Vollmer, for many years chief of police in Berkeley, California and a ground breaker in bringing more humane and scientific methods of police work. John Larson and, slightly later, Leonarde Keeler, both Vollmer protégés in Berkeley who subsequently decamped to Chicago, were the pioneers in developing the polygraph machine and testing techniques. Their’s is the tragic part of the story. After initial close collaboration they fell out. The methodical Larson wanted to develop lie detection as scientifically as possible. He recognized its limitations and was determined that it be applied only by the most carefully trained practitioners, with the exoneration of the innocent as an important function. He came to resent what he saw as the ambitious Keeler’s commercialization of the process and its use primarily to extract confessions. Comic relief is provided by William Marston, who popularized lie detection in every way imaginable and loudly claimed success rates well over 90%. Marston was convinced that it was only a matter of time before the natural superiority of females would put them in control of society, and he developed the comic book character “Wonder Woman” as a foretaste of the female prowess he anticipated. He lived in a contented ménage à trois with his wife and assistant/mistress. He fathered two children by each of them, and they continued to live together after Marston’s death.

Curiously for a study as fine-grained as this one, Adler describes very little about the polygraph machine itself—how it measures blood pressure, breathing, galvanic skin response (perspiration) and other bodily fluctuations—and how it is used in the testing procedure. He mentions, for example, the important “peak of tension” pattern more than once, but doesn’t explain what it is. (With repetitions of the same questions in the same order, subjects’ responses rise as the “hot” question—having to do directly with the matter under investigation—approaches, peak on that question, and then diminish with the irrelevant or “control” questions that follow it. The increasingly clear pattern is interpreted
as evidence of guilt . . . although, of course, alternative explanations are not difficult to concoct.)

From an analytic perspective, the most interesting part of the book is the Epilogue, in which Adler tackles the question of why the polygraph has such a strong appeal in the United States and virtually nowhere else. He relates this to the emphasis on equal justice in a society based on the social contract and formed of people from diverse origins rather than shared history. When this is conjoined with a faith in science (including, in popular culture, pseudo-science) as the avenue to truth, and the conviction that inner mental states are accompanied by measurable bodily states, one outcome is the American obsession with lie detection.

University of Kansas

F. Allan Hanson


Had I been responsible for the title of this uneven but ultimately useful collection of essays about Langston Hughes, I would have gone to the movies for my model. I would have done that not just because he is so photogenic or because his story unfolds over decades and continents and people and events, one scene after another. No, it would be because there is a movie the title and “argument” of which sums up the picture this collection gives us of Hughes: That Obscure Object of Desire. Reading the twenty evocations brought together here is like reading twenty versions of a discussion between Countee Cullen and Alain Locke about Langston’s charms. Is he or isn’t he, will he or won’t he, did he or didn’t he?

Why, one is led to wonder from time to time, are so many in pursuit of this man who, truth be told, despite working in multiple genres over forty years, produced not one stand-alone text that captures his moment. Some of the reasons can be found in this collection which gives ample evidence of Hughes’s appeal to scholars of various interests and, yes, desires. In their accounts Langston is religious and secular, a bluesman and a jazzman, diasporic and American, gay and, if not straight, just on the “down low,” a proto-proletarian and a true Modernist, a Hispanofilo and a Slavophile, an essayist, a novelist, a poet, a children’s author, a dance critic and a filmmaker.

The very best of the essays such as those by Kate A. Baldwin, Lorenzo Thomas, Michael Thurston, and Robert Young, combine one or more of these “Langstons” with a well argued and well-researched explication of Hughes’s commitment to a personal leftist political agenda in the 1930s (although all of these folks miss an important 1933 essay on Hughes by Lydia Filatova in International Literature). The least successful tread old water, revisiting the blues or exile or homosexuality each through a monocular lens. Nevertheless, many of these more quotidian essays are useful and instructive.

This collection reflects themes and discussions that emerged at the centennial observation of Hughes’s birth held at the University of Kansas in 2002 and so can be expected to be diverse in focus and scope. That accounts for the ghetto-ization into a concluding section of some very intriguing essays on Hughes’s writing for children, on his interest in dance in black culture, his sojourn into Hollywood’s ever-disappointing racial schizophrenia, and his career as an essayist over some thirty years. Hughes offered something for everybody, it seems. Each contributor stakes out his and her favorite or most challenging Langston but none attempts to make him all of one piece across the career.

In their “Introduction,” editors John Edgar Tidwell and Cheryl R. Ragar note that the volume is an answer to Arnold Rampersad’s call for a more nuanced appreciation of
Hughes’s complexity. Their intention is to provide a space for the newer methodologies of cultural and literary study to reinscribe Hughes for a new century. It is the virtue of the collection that it reinforces just such a complex vision and reminds us that such a project does not lend itself to “summing up.”

The City University of New York.

Jon-Christian Suggs


Amy Koritz’s Culture Makers: Urban Performance and Literature in the 1920s is a lucid and insightful cross-genre study of the engagement between cultural producers and the transformations that took effect in American society in the decade often characterized as the Jazz Age. Acknowledging the limitations of using a decade as the lens through which to view the complexities of social and economic change, Koritz nonetheless demonstrates that playwrights, dancers, novelists, and commentators all wrestled with a coherent set of developments in the 1920s. These included the “emergence of rationalized work processes and expert professionalism, the advent of mass markets and the consequent necessity of consumerism as a behavior and ideology, and the urbanization of the population, in concert with the invention of urban planning and the recognition of specifically urban subjectivities.” (1)

As Koritz states in her introduction, the book is motivated by a pair of goals. The first is to “add a new series of case studies to the rich and insightful scholarship linking the cultural realm with the material conditions and ways of understanding the world that it both shapes and is shaped by.” (4) Koritz divides her case studies into six chapters, with two each devoted to drama, dance, and fiction. The opening chapter examines representations of work in the dramas of Eugene O’Neill, Elmer Rice, and Sophie Treadwell; the second explores the tensions between consumerism and marital commitment for affluent young (white) women in the middlebrow “flapper plays” of Rachel Crothers. Chapter 3 surveys the discourse of expertise that arose to manage the gendered, raced, and classed anxieties surrounding the Charleston dance craze in the ’20s, while chapter 4 focuses on the strategies deployed by modern dancer Martha Graham, including the cultivation of an authentic self, to carve out a professional status for herself as a female artist. In the last two chapters, Koritz turns to the fiction of Anzia Yezierska, whose short stories and novels depicted the communal world of the Jewish ghetto, even as the rise of consumerism and mass markets accelerated assimilation; and, finally, to a comparison of John Dos Passos’s novel Manhattan Transfer and the commentary of Lewis Mumford, both of whom worried over the effects of urban planning on the individual lives of urban residents.

Koritz’s second, more far-reaching stated goal is to argue for the relevance of the humanities to discussions about social change and public policy. Inspired by philosopher Martha Nussbaum’s assertion that multiple genres of knowledge are necessary for the creation of just policies and practices, Koritz laments the “deficits of a disciplinary, rather than a problem-based, organization of knowledge” (138) that, for instance, have prevented cultural observers from reading Dos Passos and Mumford in tandem despite their shared concerns.

Koritz succeeds in both goals, exposing connections across disciplinary demarcations and showing that the arts—in terms of both the problems they address and the rhetorical methods they use, such as narrative and metaphor—are valuable sites for analyzing issues that dog society at large. Yet Koritz also uncovers a paradox: artists were, to a great extent, heavily invested in and complicit with the erection of the very disciplinary (and
class- and race-based) divisions that her study points to as regrettable. Koritz makes note of this contradiction in her conclusion, but one is left to wonder how it ultimately alters her book’s basic premise. One also wonders how Koritz’s own disciplinary location in literary studies may have contributed to the dominating textual focus of her study (and the shortage of visual images). How, for example, might her appraisal of race and modernity have been amplified had her discussion of the African American-derived Charleston centered on various practitioners’ embodiment of the dance, rather than on the discursive commentary that surrounded white flappers’ association with it? Still, Culture Makers presents a compelling case for interdisciplinarity and should be useful to readers across the humanities with an interest in 1920s American culture.

University of California, Riverside
Anthea Kraut


This volume contains the proceedings of a 2002 conference on the career and achievements of the legendary vocalist held at Hofstra University. In the introduction, the notable music critic and historian as well as Crosby’s major biographer, Gary Giddins, describes the performer, some twenty-five years or more since his death, as “often forgotten, or, worse, misremembered” (1). Arguably, most current music consumers fail to recognize the attraction or achievements of his mellow baritone. However, the fault might be said to arise not so much in their less than acute eardrums or skill at cultural discrimination as the generational and performative chasm between the crooner and his descendants. The affable, seemingly unconflicted and irony-free manner with which he delivered so many items from the national songbook must seem for many of them devoid of the kind of aggressive assertion of personality conveyed by the majority of their contemporary idols. To them, Crosby may well seem so relaxed as to come across as somnolent, soulless or simply sappy. Giddins argues that Crosby needs to be thought of as “the indispensable man of the 1930s and 1940s, an entertainer who represented stability in an age of turmoil.” (7) Sadly, and to the detriment of many individuals, that laudable ability to elude the trap of self-indulgence and place emphasis on the content of a song rather than the influence of the performer’s personality has become by-and-large outdated.

The participants in this conference strenuously endeavour to circumvent this generational collision, yet they achieve that laudable goal only intermittently. Unfortunately, the avuncular manner of Crosby’s style resists if maybe simply short-circuits cultural analysis. Too many of the essays adopt a position that does little more than reinforce the known wisdom about Crosby’s recordings or his radio appearances, films or public persona. They repeat with an occasionally defensive tone the virtues of a bygone era rather than establishing some novel or theoretically inspired vantage point from which either to make sense of or newly appraise his considerable achievements. The point of view that pervades the collection consequently seems more celebratory than analytic, and will appeal more to someone already enamoured of the performer than a sceptic eager to erase their doubt.

Nonetheless, some contributions merit attention. Samuel Chell’s comparison of Crosby and Sinatra not only establishes the crucial distinctions between their musical approaches but also provides one of the more thought-provoking critical templates by ascribing to the former a melodramatic and the latter a modernist stance toward vocal repertoire. Elaine Anderson Phillips’ discussion of Crosby’s embodiment of masculinity endeavours to make sense of the overtly unaggressive element of his persona rather
than simply laud its absence of audacity. Martin McQuade and Pete Hammar document Crosby’s professional and financial involvement with the Ampex Corporation fuelled the revolutionary developments in reproductive technologies that led to the marketing of magnetic tape. Too often, otherwise, Crosby’s unflappability seems to dumbfound his admirers, and leave readers without the necessary language or critical apparatus to convey the complexity of his overtly effortless performances or appraise the influence of his achievements upon the whole of our national culture.

University of Salford

David Sanjek


Anthea Kraut and Zora Neale Hurston have been living together for most of the new millennium. Looking over the publishing information at the front of Kraut’s book—a reworking of her doctoral dissertation—informs us that portions of chapters appeared in previous journals and anthologies as early as 2001. Dance researchers adhere to habits of meticulous research and detailed detective work in completing our tasks. We have to: most scholars—not to mention lay people—have little sense of what we do or how dance research (except dance anthropology) could be of interest or relevance to other disciplines. In other words, we lack credibility. To compensate, dance scholarship has become one of the most thoroughly researched interdisciplinary pursuits of our era, and dance scholars take up residence with their topics. This work is no exception.

With admirable dexterity of language and a minimum of jargon, Kraut opens the door and invites us in to a world of subtle readings and intertextual implications that surround this little-known piece of American cultural history and performance politics. Who knew that the illustrious Hurston was an accomplished dancer, choreographer, and producer of traditional dances in staged concert versions? And who would surmise that this information, as analyzed and deconstructed by Kraut, could resonate with as much meaning for literature, gender studies, and history scholars as for those of us in performance studies?

Utilizing a theory of invisibilization, “. . . to borrow Brenda Dixon Gottschald’s term for the systematic omission of the Africanist influences on American performance practices,” (x), Kraut paints a landscape fraught with the assumptions of white privilege that placed Hurston in the “damned if we do, damned if we don’t” trap that too often straitjackets Africanist creative endeavor. One example: Hurston’s efforts to place traditional Caribbean and African American dances on the American concert stage as an antidote to stereotypical interpretations are, themselves, received as reinforcements of the stereotype.

In Chapters 3 and 4 Kraut zeroes in on “The Great Day,” Hurston’s most elaborate folk (or traditional) revue, discussing in detail the backstory in creating this work and the issues arising in performing “authenticity.” Indeed, authenticity and essentialist performance politics as played out in black and white America in the 1930s—particularly the left-leaning but Eurocentric New York concert dance milieu—are keynotes of this work. In Chapter 6, “Black Authenticity, White Artistry,” the interactions that Hurston engaged in with Doris Humphrey, Ruth St. Denis, Mura Dehn, Helen Tamiris, Irene Castle, and theater director Irene Lewisohn are subjected to Kraut’s scrutiny to scope out the ways that racialized relations affected the depth and quality of these interactions, largely at Hurston’s expense.

Throughout Kraut managed to unearth amazing print documentation (newspaper reviews and articles, personal letters and accounts) to tell this story. And the extraordinary
visuals belong in the “a picture is worth a thousand words” category, with dance as a microcosm for the racialism that pervaded society as a whole.


Anne Elizabeth Carroll argues that pictures should matter as much as words in studies of Harlem Renaissance texts. Just as mainstream artists and scholars struggled in the interwar years to express a distinct national character, Black Americans sought to stake their place within the development of that identity. Carroll enters the debate on the ultimate effectiveness of efforts of New Negro leadership to shape African American identity with a study of five key publications.

Starting with the NAACP national magazine, The Crisis, and the National Urban League’s monthly, Opportunity, Carroll argues that previous studies of these publications favored the written texts over the visual texts, thereby ignoring significant material in understanding the social and political goals of the editors (W. E. B. Du Bois at The Crisis and Charles S. Johnson at Opportunity). For example, she points to the regular use of photographs of successful African Americans (mostly male) in both magazines to offset negative reports of racial prejudice and group struggle. The mix, she says, offered “a multi-pronged response to the racism that faced African Americans in the early 1920s and a multi-media redefinition of African American identity” (87). Even as close readings of key texts provide fresh insights into the material, readers would be served with the inclusion of more historical context to provide deeper understanding of the debates in which the leaders engaged.

Carroll turns next to a pair of publications produced under the direction of Alain Locke: the March 1925 special issue of Survey Graphic, which focused upon Harlem, and the subsequent expanded book published a year later as The New Negro. Carroll ends her book with the one-issue publication of Fire!!, edited by Wallace Thurman, and produced through the efforts of a team of “younger” Harlem artists that included Langston Hughes, Aaron Douglas, Zora Neale Hurston, Gwendolyn Bennett, and Richard Bruce Nugent. Carroll argues that “the range of images available in these volumes is a challenge to the process of stereotyping, the process of reducing individuals and groups of people to simplified, homogenous entities” (224). She points out that as all the publications shared in the use of multiple kinds of texts (sociological, literary, visual, statistical, etc.), they increasingly provided an appropriately diverse picture of Black America. This central argument is the strength of Carroll’s book.

Carroll’s call for more interdisciplinary approaches that account for visual as well as written messages offers potential for fuller readings of both. Her own analysis of visual texts reflects the limits of her training as a literary scholar as she relies too heavily on the written texts as a lens to read the visuals. Her book, nonetheless, invites more study along these lines. Carroll’s book would serve well in an upper-level undergraduate course as an introductory study of the interaction of texts and visuals in American magazines of the twentieth century. Her ideas are generally clear (if sometimes repetitive) and easy to follow. As the debates regarding the effectiveness of identity efforts continue, delving deeper into the varieties of Harlem Renaissance texts gives us more to think about.

Kansas State University

Cheryl R. Ragar
In *The Comic Worlds*, Iain Topliss charts the development of significant aspects of American middle-class life from 1925 to 1975 through the work of four prominent *New Yorker* cartoonists. In the process, he elevates *The New Yorker* cartoon to a noteworthy form of critical commentary. Each respective chapter on Peter Arno, William Steig, Charles Addams, and Saul Steinberg demonstrates how these artists’ work reflects well the shifting values of the periods on which they comment. In order to accomplish this task, Topliss engages aesthetic, cultural, and Freudian criticism. His descriptions of the cartoons and his aesthetic and cultural readings are excellent. But his Freudian theory, while provocative, seems a bit disconnected from his other critical approaches, even though, in his introduction, he grounds his primary argument in it. According to Topliss, *The New Yorker* cartoons offer “insights into the unconscious and unacknowledged drama of middle-class consciousness” (14-15). Arno’s dandies, Steig’s working-class families, Addams gothic ghouls, and Steinberg’s masses, share one thing in common: they identify new social experiences that are already registered “disturbingly within the individual psyche” of the middle-class American (6). By laughing at these cartoons, readers recognize experiences common to their class, which to this point, have been felt or intuited anxiously rather than grasped through language. The argument is compelling. But Topliss does not defend it thoroughly throughout his book. The strength of *The Comic Worlds* lies in its ability to demystify the embedded cultural rather than psycho-social meaning of the cartoons it analyzes, despite Topliss’ claims to the contrary (6).

There are moments when Topliss’ theoretical approaches converge nicely. As he traces Arno’s aesthetic shift from a “dandified elegance” to an “openly masculine character” (61), for example, he establishes a convincing psychoanalytic link between the artist’s cartoons and a growing sense of impotence among upper-middle-class men during the twenties and thirties. But Topliss’ theoretical positions often leave gaps in his argument. Toward the book’s end, for instance, Topliss theorizes laughter. When we laugh, we free ourselves, however momentarily, from the bondage of signification, the creation of meaning through language that makes possible comprehension and elements of the unconscious like desire. He positions this theory against a reading of advertising in order to demonstrate how *The New Yorker*'s cartoons spring us from the grip of the magazine’s seductive advertisements. If, as Topliss maintains, advertisements “activate desire” and “chain us to the chimera of consumption,” then cartoons “through the ecstasy of laughter, pick the lock” (253). Thoughtful as it is, the argument stops short of confronting complexities that impact the book’s entire project. If laughter offers temporary relief from advertising’s complex web of signifiers, doesn’t it also allow us to transcend the content of the cartoon that made us laugh in the first place? How, then, do we negotiate the tension between a reading that explores the cultural significance of cartoons and a theory that claims that the meaning of those cartoons is suspended through laughter? We may be “outside language” when we laugh (251). But when we read we prefer to be entrenched in well-constructed meaning.
Drawing on a wealth of materials, including scrapbooks kept by Ethel Merman’s devoted father and interviews with those who knew her as co-worker, family member or idolized star, media historian Caryl Flinn provides a detailed reading of Merman’s personal and professional lives, from her birth in 1908 (a date she verifies) to her death in 1984. Remaining sensitive to the changing contexts of a five-decade career, Flinn takes Merman, and especially her reception, seriously. What emerges is the first definitive biography of this ordinary and extraordinary American performer.

Especially strong is how Flinn illuminates the tensions between Broadway’s live entertainments and touring, and the increasingly homogenized medium of the Hollywood film that gained ascendancy as the 20th century progressed. Merman, while not unsuccessful in Hollywood, was more at home on the New York stage, but by the 1950s had also embraced the new national entertainment of television. After numerous special appearances, she had, as Flinn recounts, hoped to emerge as the star of a situation comedy that would have had her belting out her famous numbers in a kind of mini-musical theater format. It’s tempting to think how such a successful Merman vehicle might have bridged the televised white femininities of “I Love Lucy” and “The Mary Tyler Moore Show.”

One of many posthumous tributes to Merman, as Flinn notes, was a 1994 postage stamp where she appeared with Ethel Waters, Nat “King” Cole and Bing Crosby as one of four “Popular Singers.” While this commemorative set reflects a kind of governmental political correctness (two men/two women; two black/two white; entertainers on par with politicians), it raises salient issues of not only vocal delivery and repertory but also race, ethnicity, gender, class, sexuality, and context that surrounds “popularity” throughout the history of American singers and their songs. Merman’s “brassy” love-it-or-hate-it voice and long career (she performed at events for the Kennedy and later Reagan inaugurations) present formidable challenges. Flinn, to her credit, has listened carefully to Merman and draws attention to the impeccable diction, ability to sustain notes and sure sense of rhythm, insights that sent me back to my Merman CDs.

Flinn likewise does a good job of understanding Merman within her working class background where as an only child she received both parental support and learned real management skills. She dispatches perhaps too quickly with Merman’s relationships to other big-voiced female singers, past and present, whose belting vocality often marked them as off-color and non-normative of white femininity, images rooted in the troubling stereotypes of minstrelsy. Missing is a more nuanced presentation of the shifting landscape of “popular” singers in the 20th century, such as that of Ella Fitzgerald whose best-selling “American Songbooks” overlap with Merman’s career, and in some cases Merman’s repertory, although without Fitzgerald having had equal access to Broadway or Hollywood. Merman’s queer popularity, while not ignored by Flinn, remains undeveloped. Overall, though, Merman comes through in Flinn’s detailed telling as an active agent in her own professional business, one that for many listeners was, thankfully, show business.

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Susan C. Cook

Peter Benson provides the first full-length biography of the once famous, but now mostly forgotten Senegalese boxer named Battling Siki. Both renowned and reviled for...
wrestling the World Light-Heavyweight Championship from French boxing idol Georges Carpentier in 1922, Siki has remained an enigma, his life story shrouded in exotic myth and unsolved mystery. Benson’s meticulous primary research in over 80 newspapers and periodicals from a variety of countries enables him to begin the process of separating truth from fiction.

Challenging the typical portrayal of Siki as a primitive child of the jungle who lacked intelligence, self-control, and pugilistic skill, Benson paints a more nuanced portrait of the Senegalese prizefighter as a formidable opponent in the ring and a proud, resourceful, and self-aware man outside the ring. In 1898, Battling Siki was born Amadou M’barick Fall in Saint-Louis du Sénégal, the administrative center of French West Africa. At ten years of age, Fall sailed to France under the supervision of a white European patron; however, he was soon left to fend for himself. At fifteen, Fall began his professional fight career, donning the ring moniker of “Battling Siki.” Yet, World War I intervened, and Siki became a Private in the Eighth Colonial Regiment. A decorated war hero, he left the military in 1919 and made his way back into the boxing ring.

Much like his African American predecessor Jack Johnson (the first-ever black World Heavyweight Champion, 1908-1915), Siki was audacious in his public defiance of the racial status quo as he toured throughout Europe and the United States. He enjoyed big city excitement, conspicuous consumption, exotic pets, and white women. Not surprisingly, Siki faced concerted white efforts to not only strip him of his championship titles and ban him from boxing, but also to cast him as a savage, unprepared for the complexities of the modern world. In 1925, with his tumultuous career in decline, Siki was found murdered (most likely by the mob) in the New York City neighborhood of Hell’s Kitchen.

Although Benson writes with obvious passion and panache, capturing the vibrant, underground culture of 1920s boxing, Battling Siki is still, for the most part, a conventional sports biography. Lighter on cultural analysis and historical framing, it reveals less about Siki’s significance for the racial and imperial politics that stretched beyond the ring. For example, Siki was undoubtedly a popular hero of the African diaspora, and yet, his symbolic importance as a transnational figure of black resistance remains underexplored. It does not help that Benson tells Siki’s story in a series of vignettes that jump forward and backward in time. Consequently, the book’s narrative flow is somewhat choppy and confusing.

Nevertheless, Battling Siki is full of fresh insights. Benson carefully reconstructs Siki’s childhood in Senegal. In turn, the author refuses to pull any punches in his descriptions of the racism Siki faced in France. Finally, Benson scours U.S. newspapers for information on Siki’s difficulties in the United States, an often overlooked part of the Senegalese boxer’s life. Overall, Battling Siki does an admirable job of uncovering the many layers of this important African sports figure.

University at Buffalo – The State University of New York
Theresa E. Runstedtler


Scholars have given exhaustive attention to the 1930s, but comprehensive studies of the New Deal’s relationship to state and county governments in regarding public relief remain relatively few. In this study, Peter Fearon, Professor of Modern Economic and Social History at the University of Leicester, provides a detailed policy history of New Deal relief programs administered by the State of Kansas. Fearon observes that Kansas provided public relief more efficiently than many states prior to the Great Depression,
and the state embraced New Deal programs. Republican Governor Alfred M. Landon supported most New Deal funding, at least until he ran for the presidency in 1936, and he used federal dollars for social services that otherwise would have indebted the state and unbalanced the budget. In analyzing the relationship between Washington and Kansas, Fearon explains the organization of relief, often at the county level, discusses tensions between federal and state officials, and sorts out a host of relief-oriented initiatives, all of which remained underfunded and which occasionally generated animosity and violence.

The heart of Fearon’s study involves the efforts of state and county governments to restrict public relief to individuals deemed eligible for work as opposed to direct assistance, that is, the dole, unless the unemployed could not hold a job for various reasons, such as health. Fearon contends that Kansans overcame their philosophical objections to direct relief but always preferred assistance based on work. Not everyone who qualified for work relief, however, received it due to insufficient funding, and the counties necessarily provided assistance to the unemployed as well as the unemployable. County relief officials also were more concerned with rehabilitation than federal agencies whose primary objectives were to provide work, loans, and grants. Federal programs paid cash and state and county relief agencies provided in-kind assistance, such as food, clothing, and shelter. Yet federal, state, and county governments all sought to move dependants off the relief rolls to independent status.

In this study, Fearon emphasizes the relief activities of the Civil Works Administration, Civilian Conservation Corps, National Youth Administration, and Works Progress Administration. He also covers some agricultural relief programs and the difficulty of organizing rural people for work relief since most projects were located in urban areas where the unemployment problem proved greatest. Fearon concludes that the New Deal provided radical relief for the time, and the state adjusted and administered various assistance programs about as well as anyone could expect. This interpretation of the New Deal, of course, is not new, but his narrative rests on considerable statistical evidence, and it will be informative reading for anyone studying public relief during the 1930s. It also provides scholars with an analysis of policy making and administration on the state and county levels regarding New Deal programs in an important western state. By so doing it will serve as a comparative reference for anyone embarking on future policy studies of New Deal relief programs on a state-wide basis as well as a detailed look at relief efforts in the Kansas.

Purdue University

R. Douglas Hurt


In 1940, the vocalist and actress Ethel Waters was offered a role as the character Petunia in a Broadway musical production eventually titled Cabin in the Sky. She wrote in her autobiography, His Eyes is on the Sparrow, that “I [initially] rejected the part because it seemed to me a man’s play more than a woman’s. Petunia was no more than a punching bag for the [character] little Joe. I also objected to the manner in which religion was being handled.” Later in the autobiography Waters observed that she had been offered another role in an episodic film, Tales of Manhattan. Her interest in the part was piqued because “they told me the story they were using for our episode. Realizing what a large part God plays in [black people’s] daily lives, the producers were eager to inject religion in our part of the picture.” And it is precisely this use of African American religion by the Hollywood film industry that the religious historian Judith Weisenfeld examines in her

Weisenfeld argues “that religion was central to American film’s representation of African Americans” in Hollywood’s formative generation of sound motion pictures. Not only was black and mainly Protestant religiosity central in cinemtic representation she contends, but it was consciously used by both black and white filmmakers in competing and conflicting ways—financial gain, stereotypical entertainment, racial uplift, and religious proselytization. Weisenfeld offers the reader a behind the scenes evaluation of the American film’s industry use of African American religion, which aids her to search other important subtext about religious and cultural anxieties stemming from intellectual modernism, urbanization, and secularization. She judiciously notes that “[w]hile African Americans’ access to explicitly religious black films was occasioned at best, the existence of these films—as well as accounts of their emotional impact and commercial success—call on us to think expansively about what constitutes the stuff of black religious life, including the various visual arts, commercial or otherwise, alongside the well-mined textual and musical sources” (6-7).

Weisenfeld achieves her goals for the book by probing every nook and cranny of the film industry records. Her research is thorough and includes the records of Production Code Administration (PCA) the Hollywood film industry’s censorious rating board. She also provides sound analysis of the various filmmakers and what their films both consciously and unconsciously depicted about black life. She also brings to the reader’s attention neglected historical sources, black film critics who wrote for black-owned newspapers such as *Pittsburgh Courier, Norfolk Journal and Guide*, and the *Chicago Defender*. And in addition, the book has thirty-nine illustrations including handbills, advertisement posters, and still photographs used to advertise and promote these films to audiences. By being so meticulous in doing research Weisenfeld makes an invaluable contribution both methodologically and historically to the nexus between African American religiosity and American entertainment complex. In the aftermath of *Hollywood Be Thy Name* religious and cultural studies scholars are bound to explore this relationship more using Weisenfeld’s well researched monograph as a model of scholarship.

University of Kansas

Randal Maurice Jelks


In these two new works by John E. Miller and Anita Clair Fellman, respectively, the authors explore the continuing fascination with Laura Ingalls Wilder and her daughter, Rose Wilder Lane, and contend that the collective works of these two women have had a lasting impact on American culture in ways both subtle and obvious. Even scholars, whose work does not dwell on American children’s literature, will find much to glean from these titles.

In *Laura Ingalls Wilder and Rose Wilder Lane: Authorship, Place, Time and Culture*, Miller compiles nine expanded essays surrounding the relationship between Wilder and Lane. Loosely threaded together by their allusions to either or both of the women, the essays explore a wide variety of issues that reflect on the nature of the works, their relationships to the geographic spaces around them, and the times in which their authors lived.
The first essay addresses the structural challenges surrounding the biographer’s quest to reveal the lives of Wilder and Lane. Useful as a potential reading for graduate classes hosting future biographers, the essay clearly sets readers up for those that follow. The second essay addresses the issue of the authorship of the Little House series of books, long thought to be the work of Laura Ingalls Wilder, but now revealed to be a complex collaboration between Wilder and Lane. The third essay tackles the concept of place as Miller argues that the little houses of the books symbolize the security of the home in a way appealing to the young readers for whom the original series of books were meant.

The fourth, fifth and sixth essays explore the times in which Wilder and Lane lived, and how those are reflected in their work. In the first of these, Miller focuses on the year 1932, a pivotal year of the Great Depression, and the year in which the first Little House book arrived on store shelves. Little House in the Big Woods, he argues, was as much a product of the Depression as it was a reflection on the frontier history it was meant to present. This compelling argument needs expansion, especially in light of more recent claims about the pervasive influence of the works on American politics. Miller addresses the frontier thesis of Frederick Jackson Turner in the fifth essay, comparing and contrasting both the thesis and its criticisms with Wilder and her works, and in the sixth essay, he completes a similar comparison of Lane’s lost Missouri book with the art of Thomas Hart Benton at the Missouri capital. In each case, Miller pinpoints clear relationships between the works as produced in their own times and about the times the works are meant to reflect.

Finally, Miller addresses the issue of culture in the final three essays, focusing on Wilder’s apprenticeship as a farm journalist, the treatment of Native American in her books, and the conservative ideologies of Lane and Wilder as manifest through their works. This book should be read by any interested in a snapshot of the major issues addressed in Wilder scholarship.

Fellman more directly addresses conservative ideologies in her book, Little House Long Shadow: Laura Ingalls Wilder’s Impact on American Culture. Clearly a product of years of research and thinking about the subject, this densely packed book makes a strong case for the pervasive influence of the books’ conservative ideological positioning on American politics over the latter half of the 20th century. “The reader sees both how a self-sufficient family, responsible for its own successes, manages to survive many challenging circumstances without the aid of the government and how that self-sufficiency is somehow tied to the admirable values of individual responsibility taught by the tight, cohesive, and loving family,” Fellman writes. “Many readers would pick up that message unconsciously, without even being aware they were absorbing it” (251).

In seven chapters, Fellman outlines the biographical disparities between Wilder’s lived experience and the experiences she wrote down in her books; explores the culture of readership and fandom surrounding the texts and their permutations in other media forms; develops a strong case for the pervasiveness of the books in classrooms, libraries and homes across the country; demonstrates the continued public following for Wilder, Lane, and their collective works through the activities of fans who visit the sites where they lived and maintain virtual tributes; and shows how the libertarian ideologies of Lane and Wilder, infused in the books, appear to covertly influence political thinking of this large following. While Fellman is careful to note that her reading may not be that of others—understanding that each reader will bring his or her own interpretations to the texts—the abundance of evidence she offers leads readers to suspect Fellman is right.
Fellman’s book offers fresh perspective on the *Little House* series, and should be considered for reading in American twentieth century history and culture seminars.

Minnesota State University Mankato
Amy Mattson Lauters


As African Americans became largely urban during the Great Migration, race relations and the city emerged as a critical motif of the twentieth century. Robert C. Weaver, a relatively understudied black pioneer, occupied the center of this discourse. In his intriguing biography, Wendell E. Pritchett recreates the career of an individual who quietly influenced U.S. racial liberalism and urban policy between the 1930s and late 1960s. An architect of public housing, urban renewal, rent control and fair employment, Weaver also expanded the role of black professionals in federal government. Appointed secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) by President Lyndon B. Johnson, he was the first African American to hold a cabinet position. However, he emerges most vividly as a tragic figure who pursued incremental change through elite institutions, fruitlessly mediating between white intransigence and the democratic demands of black social movements.

Pritchett’s book functions as a fascinating meditation on the contradictions of the “Black Bourgeoisie” famously maligned by E. Franklin Frazier. A key member of President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s “Black Cabinet,” Weaver participated in transforming the scope of the federal government, even as race limited his own career. Committed to racial uplift, he was nevertheless aloof from the black working class, and championed the ability of professionals to achieve reform. This was, among other things, characteristic of his upbringing within the higher rungs of the black middle class, whose members viewed their mobility as the gateway to black citizenship. Notwithstanding his friendship with the radical John P. Davis, Weaver remained distant from contemporary grassroots black freedom struggles. His abiding loyalty to the several presidential administrations he served, further, was rarely requited (Pritchett’s description of the humiliating process through which Weaver was selected to lead HUD is particularly revealing.)

At the pinnacle of his success in the Johnson administration, he helped usher the passage of landmark fair housing and urban development acts in 1968. Yet, he was a target of widespread criticism. Although accused of lacking boldness in the face of a deepening postwar urban crisis, Weaver “oversaw the passage of more laws regarding the issues under his purview—housing production and antidiscrimination—than any period before or since,” Pritchett notes. (323) Ironically, “the very qualities that enabled Weaver to achieve success,” especially his commitment to gradual change, had become liabilities by the late 1960s. (262-263) Just as tragically, he lived to see the dissolution of “an active federal urban effort” in the 1970s, as such policies fell into disrepute. (349)

Well-researched and engaging, Pritchett’s biography reveals little about its subject beyond his public life. Still, it is an important work for specialists in African American history and urban studies. From the standpoint of historicizing the role of African Americans in the White House—a lineage that now includes President Barack Obama—Pritchett’s work is a vital scholarly step.

University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign
Clarence Lang

By the late 1930s, swing dancers performed the “Lindy Hop,” a style marked by improvised moves, physical separation between couples, and athletic “jump turns.” They danced to “jump tunes,” upbeat and hard-driving jazz rhythms. In those same urban dance halls—often as part of the same evening’s entertainment—spectators cheered the precise fast breaks and leaping styles of professional basketball teams.

These developments all occurred within an African American milieu. Gena Caponi-Tabery envisions these innovations as part of a widespread movement. During the Depression decade, American culture celebrated life in the skies: air travel, skyscrapers, Superman. African Americans adopted this trend to their particular circumstances. The author argues that black dancers, musicians, and athletes “grabbed hold of something literally in the air—a cultural obsession with height, flight, and speed—and through their exploration and celebration they achieved a fundamental form of social, and eventually political, elevation.” (xv)

One merit of Caponi-Tabery’s work is its willingness to explore connections across African American popular culture. In analyzing public reactions to the heroics of athletes such as Jesse Owens and Joe Louis, she sees a surging racial pride and optimism in the future. Sport’s African American aesthetic shaped all-black barnstorming basketball squads such as the New York Renaissance Five, later spurring such creative flourishes as jump shots and slam dunks. Black music and dance fostered that same sense of transcendence. Between 1937 and 1942, at least 135 records included the word “jump” in the title. “Jump blues” served as a bridge between older swing music and the next generation’s rock and roll. Meanwhile, building off the traditions of the African diaspora, airborne dancers “jumped for joy”—not only casting off historic burdens, but also claiming a place in American life.

The author deserves further praise for contemplating links between culture and politics. Just as entertainers surpassed previous boundaries, she argues, the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters signed a historic contract with the Pullman Company, and its leader A. Philip Randolph agitated for desegregated employment in wartime production. “On a broad scale,” writes Caponi-Tabery, “African Americans were giving themselves cultural permission: authority to be part of the culture, and sometimes to excel.” (137) Moreover, the victories of such black innovators shaped a broader, more optimistic mentality among a historically downtrodden people.

*Jump for Joy* is more a creative synthesis than an investigative monograph. It often relies on previously published scholarship. Deeper research into primary sources might have better explained the particular urban milieus that spawned this great enthusiasm for jumping, soaring, leaping beyond the constraints of Jim Crow America. But Caponi-Tabery forces scholars to consider intersections among sports, music, and dance, as well as their broader implications. She writes with clarity and enthusiasm, and she has identified an important moment in black public life. Her book is a vital contribution to the history of African American popular culture.

University of Memphis

Aram Goudsouzian

The word “consensus” grates like few others in American Studies scholarship. The idea of a broadly accepted set of values seems inapposite to a discipline that defines itself largely through conflict and fracture. Yet some periods of American history are more united—or less disunited—than others. Wendy L. Wall’s study of the two decades spanning the late New Deal, Second World War, and early Cold War shows how government officials, business leaders, advertising executives, unionists, interfaith activists and left-liberals coalesced around a vision of an “American Way” that enabled the nation to survive economic dislocation and global conflict.

The price of consensus, in Wall’s opinion, was high. As war clouds gathered, it forced the issue of economic justice that had animated the labor movement in the early years of the New Deal beneath the surface of national debate; class-based resentments could not be permitted to overshadow the existential threat posed by totalitarianism. The looming military crisis produced strange bedfellows. It united businessmen determined to protect their managerial prerogatives from New Deal-inspired government regulation and liberals eager to include non-Protestant “ethnics” in the national polity. The agendas of both converged in an “American Way” ideology that emphasized class harmony in a growth-oriented capitalist economy and religious, ethnic, and racial tolerance in a pluralist culture and society. For one of the few times in the nation’s history, a common creed united Americans on the left and right.

Wall views the “American Way” with thinly disguised distaste. Much of it is justified. Consensus implies conformity, and the parameters of national values between the late 1930s and early 1960s were cramped and narrow. Corporate elites, in partnership with the advertising industry, employed the “American Way” to marginalize critics of capitalism and promote a reflexive Cold War patriotism that fed the fires of anti-communist hysteria. The “American Way” ethos, Wall argues, “privileged civility over equality” (172), and perpetuated class-based injustice through the myth of interclass harmony. Indeed, the entire “American Way” project had the quality of myth, and Wall untangles the web of ideology, self-interest, and cynicism that produced it. But myths have their uses. The “American Way” offered the United States the unity it desperately needed to fight and win the most important war in human history. In addition, it helped popularize an ideal of tolerance and inclusion that would in time have a profound effect on American race relations, making possible the successes of the civil rights movement in the 1950s and 1960s. For these reasons alone, the consensus generated by the “American Way,” artificial and contrived as it was, may have been worth the price. American history contains numerous examples of noble acts that spring from morally ambiguous roots. “Consensus” may not be the most popular word in the field of American Studies, but in the case of the “American Way,” it may have offered us more than we realize.

Lawrence University


This welcome study aims to locate the intellectual and moral origins of the New Deal Federal Art Project (FAP) within a history of progressive thought in the US dating back at least to the beginnings of the twentieth century. Although the historiography of
the FAP has long recognised the contribution of philosophers and social reformers such as Van Wyck Brooks, John Dewey, and the museum director John Cotton Dana. Grieve’s book is the first to make the question of mass education and culture as ‘a whole way of life’ central to an understanding of the FAP’s genesis and modus operandi. The book is divided into two parts—the first three chapters devoted to accounts of Deweyian pragmatism and ‘art-as-experience’ thinking, the rise of interest in a specifically American culture as a ‘usable past’ and the development of institutions and a critical tradition devoted to dissemination and encouragement of this putatively autochthonous heritage. The second half of the book explores the action of these ideas and values upon facets of the FAP’s activities between 1935 and 1943—within the Community Art Center program and Index of American Design in particular. Grieve’s notion of ‘middlebrow culture’—borrowed from a number of sources, including Virginia Woolf and the BBC (pp 4-5)—is curiously not very American, given the focus of her concerns, though the term is developed within her account and related to others both contemporaneous and retrospective. This conceptual underpinning to the book is arguably both its strength and weakness. On the one hand, the term was not espoused by the FAP’s administration and an effort is needed to read policy discourse consistently ‘through’ the term and its socio-political implications as Grieve wishes us to understand them. On the other, its deployment indicates the author’s tenacious search for an analytic perspective able critically to interpret the FAP’s historical agency. The weakness of the first ‘wave’ of academic accounts of the FAP chiefly lay in its intellectual objectivism (e.g. Richard D. McKinzie) or uncritical subscription to Rooseveltian values (e.g. Francis V. O’Connor). Later studies, such as my own (Federal Art and National Culture, Cambridge UP,1995), attempted to mobilise then emergent neo-marxist frameworks based, for instance on the idea of hegemony elaborated in Antonio Gramsci’s writings in the 1920s and 1930s. Grieve’s study takes this position on board—if partly to dismiss it implicitly as ‘functionalist’—but goes on to say little in detail about social class and capitalism in the USA within formation of the nation’s culture as a whole. To this extent her account exhibits the rather vague idealism of the Progressives she celebrates. Agents within the FAP sometimes had very different, and even contradictory, aims and interests—the socialists, Marxists and anarchists in New York are the most salient group. Grieve tends to underplay these antagonisms and concentrates on places and groups and individuals whose actions (as far as they are known) conformed to this idealism. Nevertheless, this is an interesting, well-written and thought-provoking book. It raises many questions about the New Deal and how and why we should study it—especially now given the comparisons made recently between Roosevelt’s ‘moment’ then and Obama’s now.

University of Liverpool (United Kingdom)  Jonathan Harris


Jackie Ormes: the First African American Woman Cartoonist is a fascinating story about a trailblazing, multi-talented artist. Author Nancy Goldstein first encountered Jackie Ormes’s remarkable story while researching the Patty-Jo Doll inspired by the cartoonist’s popular cartoon series, Patty-Jo ‘n’ Ginger.

Ormes’s career as a cartoonist began in 1937 with the character Torchy Brown in Dixie to Harlem, which ran in the Pittsburgh Carrier for one year. Torchy Brown, a teenager from Mississippi, became a successful nightclub entertainer at the famed Cotton Club in New York. In 1945 the single panel cartoon entitled Candy ran for four months in the
Chicago Defender. It featured a young, beautiful, and articulate housemaid known for her outspoken verbal jabs on a variety of social issues during the World War II era. *Patty-Jo 'n' Ginger* was Ormes’s longest running cartoon. She produced about five hundred Patty-Jo cartoons that were featured in the *Pittsburgh Courier* from 1945 until 1956. *Torchy in Heartbeats* was Ormes’s final comic strip. Her story of a mature self-confident black woman who sought true love but at the same time led the purposeful life of an activist and community leader concerned with environmental and racial issues, ran in the *Pittsburgh Courier* from 1950 until 1954.

How did Jackie Ormes manage a professional career as a cartoonist when such opportunities for women, black or white, were extremely rare? Goldstein situates Ormes within a specific urban history and cultural context; the world of elite, middle class black Chicago during the pre-Civil rights era. The author shows how Ormes’s roots in a small, hard working middle class rural community in Pennsylvania, encouraged ambition. When Earl and Jackie Ormes migrated to Bronzeville in 1942 they were ready to seize upon the opportunities, diversity, and ideas vital city life in Chicago offered. While her husband managed an upscale hotel for African Americans, Jackie drew upon her talent, beauty, and social connections to create a popular, visual form of cultural expression that served as a critical voice for a mostly African-American audience.

The high quality of Ormes work is evident in the large sampling of comic strips and cartoons Goldstein rediscovered. Her detailed, finely drawn figures, objects, and settings showcase interesting storylines defined by glamour, intelligence, and style. Influenced by race, gender, and class, Ormes drew upon black women’s beauty practice and imagery to create characters that articulated self-pride and modernity. She rejected caricatures and rarely used famous people. She spoke ‘truth to power’ through everyday people and circumstances her readers recognized.

Goldstein’s book is a preliminary study. The author admits that the lack of scholarly articles and personal letters or papers limited her investigation. However this is still a significant book on an important American cultural expression, and rarer still, the first African-American woman cartoonist. Further research of Jackie Ormes prodigious output awaits comics scholars, art historians, American studies, feminists, and social historians.

University of Memphis
Earnestine Jenkins


In the postlude of *Café Society: The Wrong Place for the Right People*, Art D’Lugoff, owner of the Village Gate, offers a tribute to Barney Josephson at his 1988 memorial service: I think Barney and his story should be made into a movie . . . I think Café Society should be the story that is told about our century” (338). Josephson’s career as a nightclub impresario—which is the subject of this book—spanned from 1938-1984 and indeed featured the kind of dramatic contours that make great movies.

Josephson opened his first nightclub, Café Society, in Greenwich Village in 1938 and the swankier Uptown branch shortly thereafter. It was the first club in which complete integration—both onstage and off—was official policy. Black and white cultural figures, politicians, celebrities, jazz fans and the simply curious flocked to both locations to see a legendary roster of artists. Billie Holiday, Lena Horne, Hazel Scott, Mary Lou Williams, Teddy Wilson, Art Tatum, and Frankie Newton were among the numerous, great jazz, blues, and gospel musicians who performed there along with equally talented comics and
dancers. Because of this talent and Josephson’s forward-looking policies, the club went down in jazz history and in the history of American race relations.

When his communist brother Leon found himself on the House Committee on Un-American Activities blacklist, Barney and those associated with his clubs were fingered as well. Josephson was forced out of the business by McCarthy but returned in the 1950s with his Cookery restaurants. The location in the Village spearheaded a jazz and blues renaissance by providing a venue for classic performers like Mary Lou Williams, Alberta Hunter, Ruth Brown, and Marion McPartland.

Josephson was indeed an innovative and savvy businessman. He ran celebrated, successful clubs though the Great Depression, Jim Crow, and McCarthyism while contributing to the careers of countless artists. *Café Society*, part posthumous personal memoir and part cultural history, will be of value to students and scholars of U.S. jazz, and of American cultural and political history. Josephson’s widow, Terry Trilling-Josephson captures his story by piecing together passages from his notes and tapes along with well-researched primary and secondary sources (press clippings, oral histories, letters, photographs, etc). The personal narrative she creates is richly augmented and highly entertaining if at times off-balance. Josephson too often comes off as larger than life—he “discovers” the talent, he teaches the talent how to dress, how to walk, how to sing and perform, his politics and morals are beyond reproach. This unidimensional treatment of Josephson’s professional approach insults the agency and talent of featured artists. The narrative can miss the point about what made Café Society and even the Cookery so historically significant and special: the art and the artists—especially the music and the musicians—with their overlapping but varied political and aesthetic motivations not only reflected the cultural currents of their time but shaped them as well. The Café Society “movie” would not be a biopic, but would instead be driven by a talented and outspoken ensemble cast.

Center for Black Music Research, Columbia College Chicago

Monica Hairston


Few topics in Hollywood’s history have drawn more attention than the infamous blacklisting of actors, directors, producers and screenwriters in the post-World War II era. Hundreds of books and scholarly articles by those blacklisted, those who testified against them and historians have been published in the last five decades.

Humphries argues that unionization, as much as ideology, was at the heart of the efforts to purge liberals from Hollywood. Were screenwriters artists creating original work or contract workers controlled by the studios? During the 1930s screenwriters on the right and left fought over this issue and for control of the Screenwriters Guild. Communist Party members John Howard Lawson, Lester Cole and John Bright and other liberal members eventually won control of the union which the NLRB recognized as the only bargaining representative for writers.

The ideological wars quieted during World War II but were not forgotten by the right and the studio moguls. Movies such as Mission to Moscow (1943), I (1943) and others infuriated the right who considered them little more than communist propaganda. The battle for control of the screen erupted with vengeance in 1947 when HUAC (House of Un-American Activities) began an investigation into communist influence in Hollywood.

The 1947 hearing turned into guerilla-theater with friendly and unfriendly witnesses. The Hollywood Ten, John Howard Lawson and other screenwriters, were sent to prison.
for contempt of Congress. HUAC expanded with purge in the early 1950s when it summoned hundreds of other Hollywood activists to explain their politics to the committee.

It is a well-known story that Humphries brings to life with an excellent chapter on the actual impact of the blacklist on many of Hollywood’s elite. Screenwriters Albert Maltz and Dalton Trumbo fled to Mexico. Director Jules Dassin and writer Michael Wilson settled in France where Wilson wrote Oscar nominated screenplays under various pseudonyms. Others like William Wyler stayed in America, but were forced to beg forgiveness by writing humiliating letters to studio bosses. Canada Lee and John Garfield were unable to work and tragically died early deaths. The chapter helps readers understand the real life issues associated with this sad and tragic episode in Hollywood. It was much more than just politics.

The concluding chapter is a curious evaluation of what Humphries terms the victory of the witch hunters. The purging of the left was not restricted to Hollywood. Humphries casts the broad net of McCarthyism and anti-communist hysteria across the American landscape and the end result, he argues, was the defeat of universal health care, President Nixon’s war crimes in Vietnam and Cambodia and the passage of the Patriot Act in 2005.

Despite this rant, or perhaps because of it, the book is an engaging read. Humphries dedicates his rather slim study to the Abraham Lincoln Brigade and Cary McWilliams, a liberal lawyer who helped defend blacklisted writers. It is clear from the start that Humphries is solidly with the blacklisted. Reader’s may not always agree with the author’s opinions and readings of various films, but they will never be confused about how Humphries views the personalities and issues. The book is written with passion and insight, based on solid research and a strong understanding of film. It is all a reader can ask.

University of Missouri-Kansas City  Gregory D. Black


Based on meticulous research in FBI and Justice Department documents acquired through declassification requests, *American Blacklist* is the definitive account of the origin, development and belated demise of “the single most important domestic factor that fostered and facilitated the Red Scare” (xi). A masterful narrative history of the U.S. Attorney General’s List of Subversive Organizations (AGLSO), it will appeal primarily to scholars familiar with historiography of Cold War political repression.

Goldstein explains how President Truman built upon previous programs based on guilt-by-association to create this official black list, which labeled individuals and organizations without notice, evidence presentation, or any provision for defense, circumventing due process. Zealots used it to punish social reform movements and, by citing previous associations or membership, discredit individuals, facilitating the politics of fear that came to be known as McCarthyism. Anomalies regarding list content led to confusion, bureaucratic infighting, and official negligence. Since criteria for listing were vague, and no provision existed to indicate extent or timing of Communist influence in listed organizations, the AGLSO seems to have had little effect on Communist Party political activity, let alone Soviet espionage.

Instead, for at least eight years, nearly 300 organizations, and numerous individuals who could be somehow linked to them, suffered “serious and relentless” public and private sanctions, including loss of tax exempt status, restrictions upon travel, ejection from federal housing, and loss of employment (62). Fearful that other organizations might
be listed in the future, a “silent generation” of young people became resolutely apathetic (xiv).

Beginning in 1954-1955, as the Supreme Court forced the Justice Department to incorporate hearings, the blacklist became an albatross: revealing evidence would have exposed illegal FBI intelligence operations. As bureaucrats attempted to avoid responsibility, proceedings against surviving groups were dropped, the list was not updated, and tax dollars were wasted. In the 1960s, proceedings against avowed fascists and revolutionaries were nixed, to avoid providing a public forum. This reviewer has found that when called before HUAC in 1965, Klan leaders used non-listing to certify their patriotic credentials. Dead as an instrument of overt repression, the blacklist was nevertheless not abolished: Goldstein’s most disturbing finding is that the AGLSO continued to provide the FBI with a convenient pretext for spying, ostensibly to “consider” whether targets deserved listing (53).

Goldstein’s masterful chronology of internal bureaucratic debates leaves counterfactual questions open to interpretation, which may deter casual readers unaware of implications for historiography regarding, for example the nature and extent of Communist Party influence in American life, or relationships between various counterversive discourses. American Blacklist is essential reading, however, for scholars seeking to assess the “silent generation” or the “politics of fear”(xiv). It also raises pertinent issues regarding the effects of anticommunism on the civil rights movement, the background to FBI domestic covert action programs, and the context of Watergate. Most importantly, Goldstein alerts us to the tenacity of targeted organizations, such as the National Lawyers Guild, which fought the blacklist, which will inspire those fighting for civil liberties and human rights during a so-called War on Terror.

Kadir Has University (Istanbul, Turkey)  
John Drabble


The substantial and lavishly illustrated catalogue of an exhibition organized by the Jewish Museum and traveling to the Saint Louis Art Museum and Buffalo’s Albright-Knox Art Gallery, this book’s title names the two most prominent mid-twentieth-century American Abstract Expressionist painters: Jackson Pollock, the author of dynamic non-objective compositions of poured and flung paint, and Willem de Kooning, famous for his powerful series of gesturally brushed, expressionistically abstracted images of women. While the catalogue reproduces, and the exhibition included, several works by these painters, a more accurate title would have replaced their names with those of the New York art critics Harold Rosenberg and Clement Greenberg, who are the real subjects of the publication. The most powerful and influential critics of their generation, Greenberg and Rosenberg both came from Jewish immigrant families and emerged from the Marxist intellectual crucible of the 1930s to develop rival critical viewpoints that they applied to the understanding of Abstract Expressionism and subsequent artistic developments. The formalist Greenberg favored non-representational art emphasizing the purity of its medium (which in the case of painting consisted of flat color spread across a rectangular canvas). Rosenberg, influenced by existentialism, coined the term “action painting,” which valorized the physical and psychological processes of art-making over the finished aesthetic product. Greenberg championed Pollock in the 1940s while Rosenberg was personally close to de Kooning and published extensively on his work in the 1960s and
1970s. Thus the titular pairing of Pollock and de Kooning in *Action/Abstraction* implies the rivalry between Greenberg and Rosenberg.

The book also highlights the work of several other major Abstract Expressionist painters and sculptors; the Color Field painters Helen Frankenthaler, Morris Louis, Kenneth Noland, and Jules Olitski; and a motley group of artists prominent in the 1960s including Frank Stella, Lee Bontecou, Claes Oldenburg, Allan Kaprow, and Anne Truitt. Curator Norman Kleeblatt’s essay, “Greenberg, Rosenberg, and Postwar American Art,” makes clear that the artists were selected based on the attention that Greenberg or Rosenberg paid to their work, with the exception of three included Abstract Expressionists: the white women Lee Krasner and Grace Hartigan and the African-American man Norman Lewis, who suffered critical neglect due to the period’s sexual and racial biases. In addition to Kleeblatt’s essay and introduction, the book features Maurice Berger’s cultural timeline of New York art world developments from 1940-1976, a selected bibliography by Stephen Brown, and informative essays on various aspects of Greenberg’s and Rosenberg’s careers and writing by Debra Bricker Balken, Morris Dickstein, Douglas Dreishpoon, Charlotte Eyerman, Mark Godfrey, Caroline A. Jones, and Irving Sandler. Among the best of these are Jones’s penetrating analysis of the sources and meanings of Greenberg’s reductive formalist “modern sensibility,” Godfrey’s nuanced investigation of Greenberg’s and Rosenberg’s contributions to Jewish cultural debates but general avoidance of discussing of Jewish identity in modern art, and Dickstein’s eloquent summary of these critics’ indelible contributions to Modernist criticism, which the volume as a whole impressively documents and interprets.

University of Kansas

David Cateforis


In this study of the Japanese American internment, Eric L. Muller focuses on a single, though crucial element of the wholesale incarceration of American citizens of Japanese descent during World War II: the determination of Nisei loyalty to the United States. Muller’s purpose is to follow the paper trail left by the infamous loyalty questionnaires “into the bowels of the wartime bureaucracy,” (2) a disjointed collection of military and civilian government agencies with conflicting cultures and interests, to show how any attempt to determine individual loyalty in general, as a sentiment, is doomed to confusion, arbitrariness, and failure. Considering the involved agencies’ inability to even come to a coherent definition of loyalty, Muller doubts that any such enterprise can ever have even a semblance of predictive power on individual behavior. He suggests, although without further elaboration, that past disloyalty is the only fair indicator of an individual’s allegiance. Any attempt to determine current attitudes only brings to light the bias and prejudices of the examining bodies and the bureaucrats who staff them. Muller’s most significant contribution to our understanding of the Japanese American internment is in the examination and analysis of new archival sources—minutes, letters, verbal communications on record—to trace the handling of the loyalty question by midlevel bureaucrats who interpreted, applied, and, Muller shows, often influenced, the directives of top level officials. In his conclusion, Muller identifies a stark dichotomy between military and civilian bureaucrats, whereby civilian administrators appear better able to make assumptions favorable to Japanese Americans, while military administrators tended to see loyalty as a function of race and ethnicity. In comparative terms, this is convincing, although other studies of civilian administrators (Brian Masaru Hayashi) reveal more insidious motives.
to their concern with the internees. From an American Studies perspective, Muller’s analysis and archival work can be a springboard for the investigation of other closely or loosely related problems. One such concern, only alluded to by Muller, is the character of modern evil, which, though horrific in its consequences, may be characterized as banal (Hannah Arendt) and depersonalizing (Zygmunt Bauman) in its mechanics; another, is to understand how loyalty functions when diversely qualified as “national”, or “racial”, or as a necessary attribute of a juridical understanding of citizenship. From this reviewer’s perspective, this book exhibits one limitation, namely a diminutive view of the political, visible in the (not infrequent) suggestion that agencies and individuals were motivated by “just politics.” (82) This approach precludes areas of inquiry which, although more ambivalent than Muller’s excellent evidence-driven research, should remain open. In modern political systems, legitimated from below, mere being is already political behavior. Thus, the anxiety of the military and the inquisitiveness of civilians, both so well documented by Muller in this valuable contribution, may be rooted in different understandings of the political.

John Jay College of Criminal Justice


This unique, important book comes out swinging and packs a punch. In pithy prose Ramírez reassesses pachucas—everyday, working-class female zoot suiters, and la pachuca—iconographic, symbolic figure. Both “pachucas as agents and la pachuca as icon,” (xiv) she argues, were “silenced” and “rendered invisible by Chicano cultural nationalism.” (12) Using gender as a category of analysis from start to finish, she convincingly shows how “the conflation of the ideal Chicano subject with the male Chicano body erases Chicanas.” (13) Ramírez places pachucas at the center of history, reversing the accusatory tropes of vendida (“sell-out”) and malinche (“traitor”), and skillfully answering her own question, “who has betrayed whom?” (21). The book is thus a critical “intervention” presenting “alternative interpretations.” (xviii) and a self-confident, “self-conscious recovery project” (xv) that reinserts Chicanas into the historical record, particularly regarding the wartime Los Angeles Sleepy Lagoon incident and zoot suit riots, and Chicano expressive culture.

Her main arguments are that pachucas have been mostly invisible in twentieth-century Chicano history, and that la pachuca has much to teach us about both U.S. nationalism and Chicano cultural nationalism, Americanism, full or first-class “citizenship, and resistant cultural, gender, and sexual identities and their contradictions.” (xv) Structurally, the book’s “dual perspective” encompasses the World War II and Chicano Movement eras, statist and insurgent nationalisms, thereby allowing her to “use one nationalism to relativize and shed light on another.” (xvi) To substantiate her arguments, Ramírez draws from numerous sources, including archival special collections and personal papers, oral history interviews, periodicals and newspapers, poems, plays, films, short stories, novels, paintings, photographs, corridos (ballads), etiquette guidebooks, patriotic propaganda posters, trial court testimony transcripts, and Lowrider magazine cartoon strips and advertisements.

Engaging with feminist and queer studies, Ramírez analyzes bourgeois conventions of proper domesticity and respectability, the performance of oppositional masculinity and “dissident femininity,” (110) the blurring of public and private spheres, and the politicized “heteropatriarchal” familia of Chicano power ideology. (113) Her fresh rereadings of the
secondary literature contribute to conversations in American studies, ethnic studies, and cultural studies, especially work on visual culture, hipness and coolness, and spectacular subcultures marked by conspicuous consumption “and conspicuous occupation of public space.” (23) Some critics may question the notion of “style politics” or “style as resistance,” (56-57, 84-85) but Ramirez persuasively provides ample examples, ultimately proving the power of culture “not only to reflect but to produce history, narrative, and meaning.” (xv)

After a preface, an introduction, and four research chapters, an epilogue links the participation of U.S. Latina soldiers in the war on terror to her larger rumination on nationalism, violence, homegirls, and the home front. In the end, Catherine Ramirez’s informative, illuminating book responds respectfully to one of the Chicana historical actors she quotes, who said, “We have not been able to have our side of the story told.” (44) With an ear for language and an eye for fashion, the author validates the legacy of once vilified women who shook up the status quo with panache, impudence, insolence, insouciance, and insubordination.

University of California Riverside


The year 2004 was the centennial of the birth of the American physicist J. Robert Oppenheimer, father of the atomic bomb and the most recognizable scientist of the twentieth-century after Einstein. During the years centered around 2004, Oppenheimer scholarship moved to a remarkably high level. One immediately thinks of the Pulitzer Prize-winning biography of Oppenheimer, American Prometheus, by Kai Bird and Martin Sherwin. But there are other outstanding books and Thorpe’s Oppenheimer: The Tragic Intellect is definitely one of them. In a review, historian Richard Polenberg (Cornell) wrote that Thorpe’s book “is one of the finest books I have ever read.” The journal Metascience devoted a 37-page symposium to Thorpe’s book with reviews by Sheila Jasonoff (Harvard), Michael Gordin (Princeton), and Andrew Jewett (Harvard) along with Thorpe’s response.

Thorpe is a sociologist of science at the University of California, San Diego, and his book “grew out of [his] doctoral dissertation” done under the supervision of historian and sociologist of science Steven Shapin. Thorpe’s book is unique in Oppenheimer scholarship since his aim is “to provide a biography that draws together individual character structure and social structure, looking at the social processes and collective work though which individual identity is constituted.” (xv) In other words, it is “a sociological biography.” One is reminded here of C. Wright Mills and “the sociological imagination” which enables us “to understand the larger historical scene in terms of its meaning for the inner life and the external career of a variety of individuals.” Thorpe’s choice is ideal for Oppenheimer was uniquely placed—shaping, as well as being shaped by, the historic forces and violence of his times.

Though Thorpe covers Oppenheimer’s youth, his becoming a theoretical physicist, and his early years as a Berkeley professor, Thorpe’s main focus is on Oppenheimer’s later life—his leadership at Los Alamos during WWII, the loss of his security clearance in 1954, and Oppenheimer as a public intellectual especially after 1954. Magnificently researched with wonderful detail, the book develops several themes in the spirit of Max Weber—Oppenheimer’s charismatic leadership at Los Alamos as “a collective accomplishment,” Oppenheimer’s security hearing as epitomizing the public “disciplining [of] experts” and the bureaucratization of science into the national security state, and Oppen-
heimer’s conception of science as vocation and a resulting vocational ethics. The moral crisis of the atomic bomb and responsibility is addressed through the actions and inner contradictions of Oppenheimer himself. In the end for Thorpe, Oppenheimer is personally tragic—a fragmented self who “accommodated himself to and internalized the culture and mentality of the national security state.” (xv) Moreover, the alliance of science with the national security state appears sociologically tragic by leading to a sacrifice of the independent cultural authority of science.

While a central and defining work in Oppenheimer scholarship, Thorpe’s book is very accessible and should be of interest to all readers especially those interested in Cold War America.

Lebanon Valley College

Michael Day


In this lucidly written and exhaustively researched monograph, Wilson Miscamble tackles the ever contentious issue of the origins of the Cold War. Focusing primarily on U.S. policy-making, but making excellent use of British records and recently available Soviet sources, Miscamble probes whether Harry S. Truman sharply changed American policy toward the Soviet Union from wartime cooperation to postwar confrontation. In a detailed, nuanced, and sometimes emotional analysis, the author concludes that Truman did not deliberately reverse FDR’s “grand design” toward the Soviet Union—at least not until he had tried unsuccessfully for nearly two years to reach lasting agreements with Josef Stalin’s Russia.

Miscamble depicts the “seasoned if unsophisticated politician” (1) who assumed the presidency in April 1945 as sincerely committed to continuing the policies of his charismatic predecessor. Nonetheless, because Roosevelt had never briefed his vice-president on the details of the Yalta Agreements or the Manhattan Project, the inexperienced Truman had to consult FDR’s advisers to learn what U.S. policies were. Amid contradictory advice from advocates of firmness, such as Ambassador Averell Harriman, and from those who urged cooperation, such as former Ambassador Joseph Davies, Truman stumbled through his first months in office, sometimes trying tough tactics, including his initial “sharp” encounter with Soviet Foreign Minster Molotov, and sometimes going the extra mile in sending FDR’s favorite emissary Harry Hopkins to Moscow in June to accept a Soviet-dominated regime in Poland. Even at the Potsdam Conference in July, where Truman and Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, buoyed by the successful atomic bomb test in New Mexico, pressed Stalin to accept only zonal reparations in Germany, Miscamble argues that “tactical policy making on the run” produced sphere-of-influence arrangements were very much “in sync with the broad Roosevelt approach” of cooperation (213, 215). As to that “most controversial decision” (218) to drop the atomic bombs on Japan, the author effectively refutes claims that Truman unleashed nuclear weapons primarily to intimidate the Soviets and not to end the Pacific war with the fewest American casualties. In a careful moral exegesis, Miscamble, himself a Catholic priest, posits the “least abhorrent” choices available in August 1945 and concludes that Truman had “blood on his hands, but he stopped the veritable flood of blood on all sides.” (248) Despite his chapter title of “Intimidation,” the author minimizes the extent to which Soviet policies hardened in response to Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Thereafter, from autumn 1945 until the end of 1946, Truman’s approach to the Kremlin was marked by “indecision and even confusion” and by “floundering between collaboration and confrontation.” (262) Not
until the Truman Doctrine of March 1945—and then “only in a piecemeal and staggered manner” (303)—did the president and his advisers adopt a calculated Cold War strategy of containment.

Miscamble’s compelling and persuasive narrative is marred only by his occasionally testy comments about “the many American academic historians” (331) who have criticized Truman’s role in bringing on the Cold War. Because he so effectively underscores the contingencies, oscillations, and inadvertent outcomes that characterized U.S. policies in 1945-1947, he should be more tolerant of colleagues who have interpreted the same evidence differently.

University of Connecticut

J. Garry Clifford


The period of American history stretching from the end of World War II to the present is large, complex, and getting more so all the time. Both the size of this volume (over 500 pages) and its imposing title might suggest an attempt at a comprehensive or “definitive” history of this monumental era, but this book is actually nearly the antithesis of that. Most of the nineteen essays here eschew traditional approaches and instead lean towards innovative and unusual treatments, often combining or juxtaposing familiar themes in novel ways. The largest parts of the book are divided into “culture” and “politics” essays, but even those categories are frequently blurred, and an attention to political economy, corporate capitalism, and technology permeates the entire volume.

A quick look at the “culture” section reveals something of the breadth and tenor of the entire volume. The first essay explores the recent history of America’s “public space,” focusing on the democratization of access to public space as a result of the civil rights movements and its simultaneous diminution and privatization in a world of suburbs, automobiles, and shopping malls. Two articles examine the impact of technological change on popular music and the visual images that shaped postwar American culture, while another looks at the interaction of “commerce” and cultural criticism, focusing on pop art. Yet another describes the confluence of military and sport influences in creating a “warrior” culture among post-war American males. Even more conventional essays—those dealing with American attitudes towards work, death and dying, or home, family, and children—are unusually capacious and attuned to the interaction of technology, economy, politics, and social history.

Many of the “politics” articles are in the same vein, exploring, for example, interactions among religion, gender, education, and politics, or themes like the impact of television on American ideas of democracy. An especially genre-bending study looks at the losing battle fought by Martin Luther King, Jr. and Walter Reuther against what they saw as licentious behavior and individualistic self-interest among workers and African Americans in support of movements based on a kind of communitarian or “republican” moral virtue.

As in any collection of this type, different readers will surely find some essays more suited to their tastes and interests than others. Very occasionally attempts to be innovative feel quirky or idiosyncratic. Overall, however, both the quality of these essays and the level of interaction between the authors are exceptionally high. Paradox and irony are apparent everywhere: Outlets for individual expression and identity multiply even as “Big Brother” government and corporate “big business” flourish; technological change is almost always multi-dimensional; capitalism is both liberating and destructive; the
working class and ghetto cultures that Reuther and King found so problematic were also expressions of freedom, democracy, and individualism.

Students and scholars of American Studies should find this book, with its “cultural” focus and its mixing and blurring of traditional disciplinary boundaries, an unusually congenial and fruitful exploration of recent American history.

WAYNE STATE COLLEGE

KENT BLASER


The baby boomers, the cohort born between 1946 and 1964, is, as sociologist Paul C. Light noted in 1988, “the most analyzed, overgeneralized, stereotyped, and caricatured generation” in American history. Constituting nearly a third of the U.S. population, this age group has long been thought of as a distinctive generation which fundamentally altered American attitudes and behavior for better or worse. To their proponents, the baby boomers constituted a uniquely idealistic generation which liberalized attitudes toward dress, demeanor, gender, grooming, race, sexuality, and work and helped to make the United States a more tolerant and less rigid and repressed society. To their detractors, members of this cohort, showered from birth with attention and resources and raised permissibly according to the tenets of Dr. Benjamin Spock, grew up to become a spoiled, selfish “me” generation which has had a particularly difficult time sustaining relationships and assuming responsibilities.

As Victor D. Brooks, like earlier scholars such as Doug Owran and Landon Jones, shows, several factors contributed to a sense of a distinctive generational identity: These included the cohort’s size—75 million, 25 million more than in the preceding 19 years, which made it “the pig” in the demographic “python”; the relative affluence of its childhood, which contrasted markedly with their parents’ depression and wartime upbringing; and its association with the broader social and cultural phenomena, such as the growth of suburbs and the postwar consumer culture, the birth of television, the cultural upheavals and movements of the 1960s, drug experimentation, rock music, and the divisions spawned by the Vietnam war.

Brooks follows this cohort’s experience from birth through the 1960s. For many older readers, the book offers a highly evocative stroll through memory lane, with captivating references to fads, movies, music, television shows, and toys. Boomers identifies several distinctive features of a postwar childhood, such as the importance of neighborhood-based peer groups; the significance of negotiation and bargaining in large families; the Cold War tensions that colored childhood; and the sense of a common generational identity fostered in schools and by television, movies, and music. Especially interesting are the discussions of family relations (especially sibling rivalry) and of the “tug of war” between pre- and post-World War II values, evident, for example, in girls’ fashion, where an informal tomboy look of overalls and pigtails collided with more formal dresses and bangs, or in the cultural value attached to a stay-at-home, full-time mother and the increasing tendency of married women to enter the paid labor force.

What one most wants to know is how this cohort’s historical experience shaped this its politics, outlook, and behavior, a challenge all the greater because baby boomers are not a homogeneous group (with the oldest boomers maturing at a time when the economy was expanding and the young in a period of stagflation). What Brooks suggests implicitly is that the baby boomers’ upbringing had contradictory consequences, on the one hand, spawning a sense of entitlement, a heightened preoccupation with self-fulfillment, and
generational chauvinism (the sense that their generation constituted the most enlightened, privileged, and moral generation ever), and on the other, a somewhat skeptical or critical attitude toward conventional conceptions of gender roles, parental authority, government, religion, and the workplace—an outlook that could lead in either conservative or liberal directions. Brooks’s book is one of a number of new or forthcoming books which will help us move beyond myth, caricature, nostalgic memories, and gross overgeneralization and better understand the lasting imprint of an age cohorts’ upbringing and formative experiences.

Columbia University

Steven Mintz


C. Wright Mills was first a gifted student of pragmatist philosophy. He then made himself into one of the leading sociologists of his generation (certainly the most notorious). Before he died in 1962 at the age of 45, Mills had metamorphosed again into a talented full-time political writer who challenged the institutional bases and cultural roots of domination for an increasingly alert public and in so doing contributed mightily to the intellectual foundations of the New Left. Daniel Geary selected an altogether interesting and timely subject for his first book.

Geary’s distinctive aim is to interpret Mills’ thought as being “far more characteristic of his era than has been recognized.” (3) “Although Mills often found himself in the minority,” Geary explains, “he nevertheless learned from others who shared his positions and frequently borrowed from mainstream discourse.” (3) “Indeed,” Geary avers, “Mills’s ideas resemble even those of the liberal political thinkers who were his primary targets and against whom scholars generally contrast him today.” (3)

Geary’s version of Mills appears thus a pean to left-liberal sensibility and an effort to make Mills safe—safe and respected like he was in the 1960’s, presumably. That Geary has produced 250-odd pages which ambitiously advances nothing new and certainly nothing radical about Mills and his writings—but nothing overtly wrong, either—says more, I think, about our own comparatively tepid intellectual and political climate than it does about the “major developments of midcentury intellectual life” (3), the true subject of Geary’s intellectual history for which Mills serves as optic.

Let me be clear: by standard academic standards, Radical Ambition is a well-researched and well-written book. Geary makes deft use of archival material and grounds his study in much, although not all, of the best literature on Mills. Moreover, the book’s six chapters and separate introduction and epilogue bespeak an often astute analysis of Mills’ sociological oeuvre. My aim is not therefore to slight Geary’s scholarship, nor do I wish to dampen his evident enthusiasm for Mills, which I share. It is a good thing that he and the late Mrs. Yaroslava Mills had tea together at her West Nyack home, and it is productive of good scholarship that Geary received advice from Kate and Nik Mills, who, with Pamela Mills, have done much to advance and facilitate serious and fair scholarship on their father and his work.

My concern, rather, is that Geary fails as measured against his own laudable standard. While manifestly opposed to the reduction of Mills to a “motorcycle riding maverick” or any similar “captivating caricature” (1), Radical Ambition provides inadequate antidote. Geary’s banal conclusion captures the vacuum at the heart of his study: “The best way to continue Mills’s legacy is to critically apply his insights to think for ourselves about the contemporary prospects for American sociology and the left in our own time.” (219)
Imagine Mills’ reply to this clarion call or, for that matter, his reaction to being interpreted in terms of his proximity to “mainstream” and “liberal” thought. That Geary seems incapable of such radical imagination renders Radical Ambition a well-informed nullity. Too bad Geary did not reference much less engage the work of John H. Summers, the intellectual historian whose similarly recent but comparatively trenchant Mills scholarship eschews Geary’s march into the academic void.

University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Steven P. Dandaneau


Timothy Brennan may well be the Ishmael of critical theory: his hand is against every man’s, and every man’s hand will be against his— at least some of the time. In the nine essays that comprise Wars of Position, he offers bracing and often brilliant critiques of the new Italian neo-Schmittian left, the use and misuse of Gramsci in postcolonial theory, most varieties of cosmopolitanism, Hardt and Negri’s Empire and Multitude, and the academic left’s aversion to politics of state, which has left it without an “organizational imaginary.” Brennan’s critique of the anarcho-Foucauldian left also leads him to spend a chapter arguing that Edward Said wasn’t really all that into Foucault after all, and while I admire the effort, the chapter reads like a strained insistence that Gayatri Spivak never devoted very much time to Derrida.

But when Brennan turns his attention to actual politics, his work is markedly less successful. He writes, for example, that “affirmative action has always been relatively weak and decentralized” because it was “neither federal law nor executive order” (31). Actually, affirmative action has its origins in a series of executive orders, most notably LBJ’s epochal executive order 11246, which dictated that “the contractor will take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, creed, color, or national origin.” Later on, Brennan tries to take Lani Guinier down a notch, calling her “a paradigm of Clinton liberalism” and attempting rather ludicrously to associate her with the siege at Waco on the grounds that she is “an uncritical fan of Janet Reno” (167). In reality, far from being a paradigm of Clinton liberalism, Guinier was thrown under the bus by Clinton liberalism at the first sign of complaint from The New Republic, even before she had a chance to take her candidacy to the Senate.

Most striking, however, are Brennan’s remarks about the Balkans, a subject about which Brennan is simply incoherent. Brennan starts by claiming that “embedded in the term ‘East/West’ is sedimentary evidence of a longstanding tendency in the West to associate the racial with the socialist other” (42) and that this tendency explains why the West demonized the Serbs. This offers “one way of looking, certainly, at the bombing of Yugoslavia in the early 1990s, whose unruly Slavic actors (from the mainstream U.S. point of view) stand in quite readily for the Soviets in ways that go beyond their defiance of the U.S. government or their supposedly criminal actions. They are like the Soviets, they look like them to U.S. eyes, they speak a language ‘like’ Russian, they have the same religion, they are not quite European in the same way as are our NATO allies, they are from the same peripheral region to the east of the Europe that counts” (44). I do not imagine that the reference to the Serbs’ “supposedly criminal actions” will go over well with survivors of the siege of Sarajevo or relatives of the thousands massacred at Srebrenica. But quite apart from that nastiness, this account of the Balkans doesn’t even make sense in Brennan’s own terms, since Wars of Position also argues that the West has mapped
Marxism onto Islam: “The slippage from anti-red to anti-Muslim sentiments takes place to most observers, left and right, as though it were a wholly natural phenomenon” (xii). If indeed Western imperialism has transferred anti-Communist sentiment to the cause of Islamophobia, there is no plausible way to claim that the U.S. belatedly came to the aid of Bosnian and Albanian Muslims in the Balkans because the Serbs were too much like the Russians. In the dramatic difference between Brennan’s scorching theoretical arguments and muddled political positions, Wars of Position demonstrates, both by (deliberate) argument and (unwitting) example, the gap between the politics of theory and the practice of politics.

Penn State University


Alyson M. Cole’s first book examines the rhetorical campaign against traditionally “victimized” groups in American culture. The campaign, which Cole argues has escalated over the past three decades, both blames victims for avoiding personal responsibility for their choices (and, writ large, for the perpetuation of affirmative action laws, the welfare state and other emasculating influences in American society) and, ironically, reclaims the status of “victim” for True Victims, i.e., those who have missed out on the privileges of victimization because they do not fall into a protected class. With attention to overtones of anxieties related to race and especially gender, Cole investigates the growing body of literature in which “victim-hatred” crosses into “victim-envy” (20) and which inevitably “participates in the phenomenon it criticizes” (22). The book begins with an overview of oft-heard complaints from recent authors in the “anti-victimist” mold—most notably Dinesh D’Souza and Alan Dershowitz—but proceeds quickly to primary sources for its analysis of the ways in which would-be victims situate themselves as over and against the victim identities that conspire against their expressions of independence and individuality.

In two related chapters, Cole addresses anti-victimist campaigns as they figure in post-second-wave feminist writings and therapeutic literature, respectively. In response to hard-fought battles over society’s tendency to “blame the victims” of abuse and rape, she suggests, contemporary authors such as Naomi Wolf and Camille Paglia have emphatically resisted what they see as the attempt to gain power through powerlessness.

Most interesting and a bit out of place is the provocative fourth chapter on Black Power veteran Julius Lester’s conversion from “militant black anti-Semite to Jewish critic of black anti-Semitism” (80). Rich in psychosexual analysis, this chapter frames Lester’s appropriation of his Jewish heritage (through his great-grandfather) as a “search for a pure victim position” (80-81), as evidenced by Lester’s intense interest in the Holocaust and in the narrative of Jews as survivors. Cole reads Lester’s autobiographical Lovesong: On Becoming a Jew (1988) as an attempt to publicly separate himself not only from his militant anti-Semitic past but also from his blackness. Writes Cole:

By leaping into the void and becoming a Jew (i.e., symbolically non-black) Lester may also suppose he is becoming a better ‘black,’ for he imagines that as a black Jew he preserves his role as the eternal outsider, the role he claims other African Americans have abandoned. He therefore employs Jewish identity not only for the purpose of making his blackness fade but also because the hybrid of the black
Jew will secure for him the status of ultimate pariah, forever hung between two worlds… (91).

With this passage, Cole connects the chapter to the book’s general argument about the simultaneous rejection and appropriation of various components of victim identity; however, the chapter presents such a methodological and theoretical departure from the rest of the book that it probably deserves separate treatment in an independent piece.

The book concludes with a chapter on the rhetoric of the 9/11 attacks as emblematic of a national attempt to frame victimhood in terms of a “manly heroism that is deeply ambivalent about suffering and sacrifice” (162). Here Cole discusses Mel Gibson’s popular movie The Passion of the Christ (2004) as the latest iteration of American Christianity’s pursuit of more masculine images of Jesus that lend themselves well to the “war on terror” and the myth of American exceptionalism that drives our “millennial struggle for freedom” (167)—freedom not just from terror but from the victimists who undermine national strength and unity. The Cult of True Victimhood weaves together current themes from religious studies, rhetoric, and cultural studies that provide a useful explanation of the linguistic stances that inform American discussions of victimhood.

Jennifer L. Heller


Avowedly intended for general readers, Alabaster Cities is a clearly organized and cleanly written account of major trends in the growth of American metropolitan areas from the decades of post-1945 prosperity to the current post-industrial era. Short identifies four general themes: economic globalization; the role of public policy; the segmentation of metropolitan regions by class, race, and government authority; and the changing character of active citizenship. These are all on target, with the last being the most original as the author develops it.

A geographer rather than historian, Short organizes most of the book as topical chapters covering downtown, suburbanization, metropolitan governance, industrial change, race, housing, and politics. The chapters begin with quick historical background, examine some key episodes of legislation and policy, and describe emerging urban patterns. Specialists will not be surprised by the examples: the Pruitt-Igoe housing project, urban renewal of Boston’s West End, Baltimore’s reworked waterfront, but each example is clearly and succinctly summarized. The maps and charts are crisply done and effectively used.

The author is to be commended for describing the experiences of second-level cities like Baltimore and Cleveland in addition to the expected treatment of New York and Chicago. Regional balance is a bit more of an issue. I counted the instances in which a city is used as a substantial example (being featured in a paragraph or more). Twenty-three different cities east of the Mississippi River account for thirty-seven such appearances. From west of the big river are only ten cameos by only seven cities. This tabulation does highlight one of my few concerns. Short explicitly identifies American urban history as an eastern and international story in contrast to the frontier and wilderness narrative of western history—hence a book about “alabaster cities” to contrast with hypothetical books about “purple mountain majesties” and “fruited plains.” This assumption ignores the reality that the West has been the most urbanized part of the United States for more
than a century (and also means that the author has no truck with the problematic “Los Angeles school” of urban studies).


Portland State University
Carl Abbott


Why are all biographies of Martin Luther King, Jr. essentially the same? Is it because at just over a dozen years King’s leadership role in the civil rights movement was so short? Is it because the research materials for King’s life have been so exhaustively mined? Is it because King’s “Montgomery-to-Memphis” life narrative has become so much a part of modern American folklore? Whatever the reasons, the reason that such books continue to appear is less of a mystery. King still holds an insatiable fascination for students of the civil rights movement and the general public alike. Harvard Sitkoff’s account is timely in two ways. This year marks the fortieth anniversary of King’s assassination, and it may well see the first African American elected to the White House.

Sitkoff’s book is part of an increasing body of work that seeks to challenge the cozy images of King in popular culture, grounded in his 1963 “I have a Dream” speech at the March on Washington, which portrays him as a saintly figure of racial reconciliation. Sitkoff presents a more radical and sometimes flawed King, one who is willing to declare that “fucking’s a form of anxiety reduction” (64) to excuse his numerous marital infidelities, and to criticise America’s militarism with reference to the Vietnam War, as much as he is willing to affirm brotherly love and a belief in the American way.

Nevertheless, at times Sitkoff is seduced by the folklore. For example, he repeats the notion that King and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference’s (SCLC) pivotal 1963 Birmingham campaign was a carefully orchestrated strategy in “Project C—for confrontation” (92). In fact, it was King’s SCLC lieutenant, Wyatt Tee Walker, who labelled the Birmingham campaign Project C after the fact—it was called Project X at the time—and who played up just how premeditated events there were in the years after. At other times, Sitkoff can be harshly over-critical of King to make his point: “King privately indulged an appetite for women and gluttony as grandiose as his ego” (64) verges on the Jesse Helms-like uncharitable.

But this is largely nit-picking. What Sitkoff delivers here is in line with his earlier overview of the civil rights movement *The Struggle for Black Equality, 1954-1980* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1981), which has become a staple undergraduate textbook in numerous editions: an easy-going, readable account that dependably touches all the relevant bases while delivering dramatic poise. In scholarly terms the book has nothing new to say, but what it does say it says well, and in doing so it has as much to recommend it as any of the other short biographies of King currently on the market.

Royal Holloway, University of London (United Kingdom)
John A. Kirk
Cedric Johnson’s new book is a provocative theoretical critique of what he deems to have been the shortcomings of Black Power both as an organizational form and as a political ideology capable of leading a successful “cosmopolitan”—by which he seems to mean a “sophisticated,” multi-racial, and multi-class struggle against “late stage capitalism” and the hegemony of right wing politics in present-day America. He chides former black militants for allowing themselves to be co-opted by “the social management strategies” of the liberal-democratic state and alleges that these former radicals have now become a “black ruling elite” who, in conjunction with a “white ruling elite,” have cooperated to moderate the relevant social change demands emanating from the more radical days of the movement.

As an example of the conservative tendencies of the black politicians who gained office as a result of movement heroics, Johnson looks at the 1970 Mayoral victory of Kenneth Gibson in Newark; focusing on Leroi Jones’ critical contribution to that victory and on Jones’s development from cultural to political leader. Johnson then describes the dissolution of the Gibson-Jones relationship and, approvingly, quotes Jones’ condemnation of Gibson as a “neocolonial” figurehead who advanced the interests of corporate Newark over the black, Latino, and working class citizenry he was elected to serve.

The problem, Johnson alleges, is that, “Too often Black Power radicals promoted the specious notion that racial loyalty-and not conservative ideology, party discipline, corporate power, or countervailing electoral pressure-would determine the agenda priorities of the new black political elite.” (79)

Yet as Gibson himself made clear in explaining his capitulation to corporate pressure, elected officials are not “miracle workers who can unravel the bureaucratic structure” they supposedly command.” (81) What he meant, of course, was that he, like many other black mayors, was not in complete control of his own city government, just as Tom Bradley in Los Angeles did not control the LAPD. So the notion of “black ruling elites” in America must be seen as the overstatement that it is.

To address this question more accurately—and what is, unfortunately, missing in Johnson’s analysis—is a fuller, more empirical investigation of the spectrum of black mayoral history and the forces that constrained and compromised black mayors in particular and black politicians in general. (Is the decline of the Congressional Black Caucus, for example, voluntary or involuntary? And why are some of its members, like former Congressman Harold Ford, voting with Republicans almost half the time? These are some of the questions implicit in Johnson’s critique that call out for more investigation.)

The wider framing of that history should include the struggles of black mayors to get elected in the first place; the struggles they confronted when in office, such as corporate flight to the suburbs, to the non-union South, and inevitably to foreign shores; the budgetary demands on depleted city budgets by white-led teachers’, policemen’s and firemens’ unions; the sniping and patronizing coverage by the white press; the budget cutbacks imposed by an indifferent when not hostile state legislature; and the related problem of an equally indifferent and often partisan federal government disposing of federal funds everywhere—except in the inner cities. So the political history is much more complex than Johnson describes and much more oppositional, which is another reason that his and Baraka’s neocolonial analogy needs rethinking.

For example, the classic role of the neocolonial comprador is of a formerly colonized petty bourgeois who collaborates with his/her former colonial power to exploit the
resources of the now “independent” state for their mutual enrichment. But, returning to the case of Newark—unlike Mobutu of the Congo et al—where are Gibson’s riches? What material benefits did he derive for his condemned complicity with the capitalist state?

In fact, rather than befriend and enrich him, in an impressive bipartisan display, state and federal prosecutors indicted Gibson not once, or twice, but three times under the Republican administrations of Ronald Reagan and the Democratic administration of Bill (fellow Democrat) Clinton! So the actual, history hardly conforms to the model of benevolent collusion that Johnson and Baraka allege.

Moving beyond race, Johnson proposes an ideal of “popular” and “democratic mobilization” of the multi-racial masses; especially the working class. In that connection, he speaks admiringly of the African Liberation Support Committee (ALSC) for its work in publicizing and mobilizing support for the campaign to end apartheid in South Africa and he credits the 1972 Gary Convention for its landmark role in posing a credible black agenda and for inspiring subsequent organizations such as the National Black Political Assembly (NBPA) and the National Black Independent Political Party (NBIPP). However he also takes these latter-day organizations to task for their “flawed assumption that racial unity is a prerequisite to addressing contemporary racial inequality.” (xxviii)

Throughout this work therefore is a tendency to idealize the masses and the working class with little reference to the abundant history of past efforts to pursue the strategy he advocates, e.g., the Communist Party, the IWW, the sharecroppers union, the Black Workers Congress, the more recent Labor Party, et al. He does point to one effort by southern workers to engage a multi-national corporation, but that example is over a decade old and is not contextualized within the devastation of the working class that has subsequently ensued. And strangely, he does not examine the experience of Jesse Jackson’s Rainbow Coalition which does fulfill some of his criteria of multiracialism and mass participation but which also failed to live up to its promise as a sustainable change element in American politics.

And there is one point made in the book to which I must take personal exception, and that is the claim that the “politics of bourgeois respectability pervaded the southern civil rights movement.” Such a denunciation is historically inaccurate and completely misrepresents the lives and commitment of Mrs. Septima Clark, Mrs. Rosa Parks, Mama Dolly in Albany, Mr. E. W. Steptoe, Mr. Amzie Moore and Jimmy Travis of Mississippi, the fabled and wonderful and peerless Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party Congresswomen: Mrs. Annie Devine, Mrs. Victoria Gray, Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer, and countless unknown others who gave their all in the belief that “We shall overcome.” So unless Johnson is finding fault with the fact that Martin Luther King was a college graduate and won a doctoral degree or is tarring the whole movement with the political anality of some of the ministers of Martin’s Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), one is at a loss to understand where this particular criticism comes from.

And a note on his weltanschauung . . . I find it curious that a theoretician of Johnson’s apparent dedication who invokes Marx and Engels and Bukharin and Mao Tse-Tung in his text, is so taken aback by what he sees as the contradictions of Black Power since contradictions are the dialectical essence of struggle . . . and History: Jesus and Judas, Hilary and Obama, Lenin and Martov, Malcolm and Elijah, Garvey and Du Bois, Lincoln and McClellan . . . ad infinitum. In politics—and life—there will always be contradictions so why should that surprise sophisticated political commentators?

Finally, one feels that Cedric Johnson’s political ire is, unfortunately, misdirected because the most grievous sin committed by black politicians is that they have, with few exceptions, failed to hold accountable the Democratic party of which they are a constituent
part-which may lose elections even with black support but certainly cannot win without it-for abandoning the interests of their constituents, and those of the nation at large, and permitting, virtually unchecked, the decades-long right wing march to constitutional subversion and political autocracy.

It is on that charge, that they may be found most guilty.

University of Massachusetts Amherst

William Strickland.


David Lewis-Colman’s examination of the relationship of black workers to the larger agenda of the United Automobile Workers [UAW] shines a much-needed-light on the politics of racial liberalism, the elephant occupying at least one room of the House of Labor. Through the years, the UAW, regarded as one of the most liberal unions, has earned high marks for its racially inclusive policies. Walter Reuther, president of the UAW, stood out as a white, labor leader marching for jobs and freedom at the 1963 March on Washington. The UAW formed a Fair Practices Committee department within the union at its 1946 UAW Convention. By the late forties, Reuther appointed himself and black unionist, William Oliver, as co-directors of the department, beefed up the Fair Practices agenda, and resurrected the Advisory Council on Discrimination, which included twelve black staff members. Reuther was also on the board of directors of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People [NAACP]. What other prominent, American labor leader did more for the cause?

Yet, exclusive policies of the UAW played a significant role in the formation of the Dodge Revolutionary Union Movement [DRUM] in May 1968. Indeed, as Lewis-Colman demonstrates, the proliferation of black-power caucuses that emerged in Detroit’s auto plants in the late sixties was a product of the underbelly of racial liberalism, patterns that he traces back to the early forties. From the perspective of perhaps the majority of black auto workers, the underbelly contained two features that undermined the credibility of UAW’s international leaders on race issues. One enduring characteristic was caving into either real or perceived racism among the white rank and file. The other involved using “their civil rights credentials to deflect criticism of their record on race.” (53) “Black activists’ primary question was how to advance black rights and freedom, while the primary question that guided the civil rights politics of the UAW’s white leaders was how to handle ‘racial problems’ without destroying unions.” Thus, the civil rights demands of black workers “often appeared as problems to be resolved rather than struggles to embrace.” (67) While support from Reuther and the executive board of the UAW was applauded when they supported fair-practices legislation, racial change, as Lewis-Colman notes, “did not flow easily out of fair-employment laws, model clauses, revised contracts, or even from international pressure.” What was needed was “sustained shopfloor pressure,” which UAW leaders feared lest the union lose support from its white base. (59) As a result, in the early sixties, while blacks represented around 20 percent of Detroit’s auto workers, they made up less than one percent of those employed in skilled positions.

Lewis-Colman’s scholarly reflection on the politics of racial liberalism provides historical context for better understanding militant uprisings led by black Detroit auto workers not just at the point of production but also within the larger community in the late sixties. This well-research study deserves a prominent place on the reading lists of courses on American labor, urban, political, and racial history.

Wayne State University

Beth T. Bates
The book "Generations of Exclusion: Mexican Americans, Assimilation, and Race" by Edward E. Telles and Vilma Ortiz uses longitudinal data to better understand Mexican American assimilation. Telles and Ortiz follow up Grebler, Moore, and Guzman’s "The Mexican American People" by interviewing the original respondents (n=684) and their children (n=758) who were located in Los Angeles, California and San Antonio, Texas in 1965. Their chief research question is: “What are the integration trajectories along dimensions of education, socioeconomic status, exposure to other groups, language, ethnic identity, and political participation?” (2). Avoiding the conflation too often found in other research, Telles and Ortiz carefully distinguish between historical or family generations and generations-since-immigration.

Telles and Ortiz use assimilation theory to frame their work, reminding readers that Portes and Rumbaut expect downward assimilation for second generation Mexican Americans and that Alba and Nee predict all groups but African Americans will eventually assimilate. Rather than presuming sweeping assimilation outcomes, Telles and Ortiz recognize that “the experiences of the Mexican American population are likely to be mixed rather than unambiguously assimilated or racialized” (5). Characteristics such as race, place, and human capital produce different pathways and rates of integration that do not always move linearly toward assimilation.

Setting up racialization (“designating people by race, thus implying their position in a social hierarchy” (15)) as counterforce to assimilation, Telles and Ortiz find that racialization is inimical to the integration process. Telles and Ortiz conclude that although assimilation is occurring with regard to social exposure, politics, identity, and culture, but more slowly than for European Americans, it is more limited in education and economics over generations-since-immigration (155). They contend that education is the “linchpin” for continued inequality, stalled integration, and ethnic persistence (131, 274). Since years of schooling are positively associated with occupational status, earnings, income, and wealth, limited education thus determines the economic exclusion of many Mexican Americans (156). Those who achieved higher education, however, experience higher inter-marriage rates and residential integration (184). The process of social stratification through education excludes many Mexican Americans from successful integration. The authors find that most Mexican Americans experience relative success by doing better than their parents but continue to lag well behind their Anglo counterparts in part because of racialization. This disadvantage is typically reproduced across generations.

Despite limited structural or socioeconomic assimilation, evidence of gradual and intergenerational linguistic and cultural assimilation is strong. While ethnic identity eroded over generations-since-immigration, the slow rate of identificational assimilation is partially shaped by racialization (237). As to whether undocumented immigrants seek to incorporate into American society, Telles and Ortiz find that 70 percent of surviving immigrants who were original respondents from 1965 became citizens by 2000.

The key contributions of "Generations of Exclusion" include disentangling historical generation from generation-since-immigration, detailing the effects of race-based social barriers, and outlining how a sample of Mexican Americans have fared since 1965 on a number of outcome measures. This work will aid scholars and students of international migration, assimilation, race, and Latinos/as in understanding how the Mexican-origin population of the American Southwest has experienced integration over historical time and across family generations.

University of Kansas

Jessica M. Vasquez
Gretchen Lemke-Santangelo presents an in-depth view of the experiences of young women who rejected mainstream society in the Sixties. Her book responds to both media stereotypes of the counterculture (“the hippie-chick” and “the earth mother”) and feminist criticism (e.g. that hippie women surrendered to an oppressive division of labor and succumbed to naïve beliefs about the differences between men and women). Without quite rebuffing these characterizations of hippie women, Lemke-Santangelo nevertheless shows that women in the counterculture were at once idealistic and inventive, pragmatic and environmentally conscious, generally fulfilled by their lifestyle and labor choices and imaginative in their thinking about gender roles and sexual attitudes.

Lemke-Santangelo takes us on a historical and, in a way, psychological journey, from the widespread decision of young women in the mid-60’s to drop out of mainstream society, to the strategic adaptation of these young women to the (sometimes very unpleasant) realities of life on the commune, to the exploration by older hippie women of new approaches to marriage and motherhood, and finally, to the eventual transition in the late 70’s and early 80’s of these (by then middle-aged) female hippies into New Age healers, yoga instructors and massage therapists. Along the way she offers vivid details of hippie women’s lives—from their sexual experiences to their birthing methods and child-rearing practices.

While clearly partial to the idealistic spirit and aesthetic impulses of the counterculture, especially as it was lived by women, Lemke-Santangelo does an excellent job of presenting a nuanced, complex view of her chosen subject, resisting the temptation to romanticize the past. She notes, for instance, that hippie rejection of their parents’ middle-class norms and late 20th century society’s accumulated scientific wisdom came with a price. “Rustic and crowded conditions also led to the spread of communicable disease. Aside from sexually transmitted infections, communes were plagued with outbreaks of hepatitis; dysentery; food poisoning; respiratory, eye, ear, and throat infections; scabies; flea; ringworm; and lice. Many communes and communards were, as clinicians noted, hygienically challenged, subsisting on scavenged food prepared under unsanitary conditions and relying on open, easily contaminated water sources for drinking and bathing” (108-109).

In the later chapters of the book, Lemke-Santangelo successfully mines the tension between feminism (as articulated by the politically active women of the New Left) and hippiedom, showing how female communards were more inclined to celebrate gender differences than to critique them. She notes that the division of labor on communes was noticeably similar to the traditional division of labor in American life, but argues that chores such as cooking and cleaning and raising children were more fulfilling in a hippie-setting than in a postwar suburban home because, on a commune, such chores were conducted by groups of women together, allowing for constant conversation, creativity and problem-solving.

Occasionally, Lemke-Santangelo makes claims that would have benefited from supporting evidence. She writes, for instance, “after joining the counterculture [hippie women] were less likely than their mainstream peers and hippie males to claim a traditional religious identity or preference.” Without evidence or documentation, it is impossible to know if such a claim is true. It would also have helped to have some sense of the scope of the hippie phenomenon. How many hippie women were there?
Much of what Lemke-Santangelo describes will seem familiar to anyone with even a passing knowledge of the Sixties. But today’s students may very well need a book like Lemke-Santangelo’s to peak their interest in the period. Moreover, while Daughters of Aquarius is ostensibly limited in its scope to the experience of one half the population of the counterculture, the book serves as an excellent overview of the hippie phenomenon writ large. Her arguably narrow lens manages to offer a wide window on the colorful, hopeful, problematic phenomenon that was the counterculture.

David Allyn

Director of Strategic Planning and Development, NJ Seeds


*Freedom’s Main Line* attempts to resituate the 1961 Freedom Rides in their right ful place in the civil rights movement. According to Catsam, segregated transportation represented the worst indignity blacks faced and the most important battle for civil rights. Studying the journey reveals that the legal challenges and nonviolent activism to defeat “public indignity” started before Brown v. Board, southern states had different responses to civil rights activism, and the rides moved civil rights from the local to the national stage placing Americans and the federal government squarely in the debate. Relying heavily on primary sources from oral and written documents, newspaper editorials, and documented conversations between Robert Kennedy and southern state officials, Catsam succeeds in placing the rides in their proper historical context.

The 1961 CORE Freedom Rides resulted from a culmination of legal and non-violent battles after WWII. Catsam details important transportation cases including the Morgan and Boynton decisions (1946 and 1960) that desegregated interstate transportation and facilities, and CORE’s 1947 Journey of Reconciliation. Despite the magnitude of these events, most black southerners did not know of their interstate transportation rights. If they did know, they were handicapped by white obstruction. The Freedom Riders sought to raise the consciousness of white and black southerners and awakened the nation.

Catsam follows the same path as the riders traveled from Washington D.C. to Jackson, Mississippi (the sight of their last arrests,) to reveal the varying state-by-state differences of white resistance. After Brown, he notes, Southern Democrats had to out “nigger” opponents to win elections and white citizens entrenched themselves deeper than politicians to prevent integration. The riders entered into this heated climate, quickly learning that arrests for breaking state laws in North Carolina were very moderate compared to the violence they faced in South Carolina and Alabama. Using the primary sources available, Catsam brilliantly documents the moments when the brave activist feared death was eminent.

Alabamians and Mississippian’s resistance changed the projection of the civil rights movement. The violence in Anniston, Birmingham, and Montgomery nearly ended the Freedom Rides, but the white hostility also turned the national spotlight onto the protesters and Southern resisters forcing the reluctant Kennedy administration to halfheartedly address civil rights. However, Governors Patterson of Alabama and Barnett of Mississippi parlayed Robert Kennedy’s federal intervention to push their own state’s rights agendas. As the riders bravely pushed into Mississippi, bolstered by fresh troops from SNCC, Robert Kennedy asked the activist for a cooling off period. However, Southern racism could not overcome righteousness. To avoid the national black eye Alabama received, following the orders of Governor Barnett who had Kennedy’s approval to ignore the Federal law, Mississippi’s law enforcement arrested the riders for breaking state segregation statutes,
sending them to the notorious Parchman prison. The ugly events in Alabama and Mississippi made national headlines that finally raised Americans’ race consciousness.

*Freedom’s Main Line* is an outstanding narrative of a transformative movement. Although the book could use more historical analysis, Catsam enhances our understanding of the civil rights movement. *Freedom’s Main Line* will compliment a number undergraduate history courses.

Grand Valley State University

Louis Moore


Maureen Ryan’s *The Other Sided of Grief* is an ambitious project that attempts to draw together the entire range of the Vietnam War experience under the umbrella term “cultural narratives.” Ryan doesn’t spend much time explaining what she means by this but her point becomes clear: the Vietnam War and “Era” still permeates the American cultural imagination and the mass media that has, since the late 1970s, fed back to us a steady stream of visions and revisions in a variety of narrative forms. Ryan quotes Ward Just’s “The American Blues” to set up her subsequent chapters that do their best to lay out the full measure of what was wrought by the U.S. war in Vietnam. Just begins his narrative with a confession that while not intending to write a “story of the war,” nevertheless “everything in my unsettled middle age seems to wind back to it.” Moreover, whereas the war itself is still “essential to the story,” the more pressing need is to express something about “the peace that followed the war.” In this sense, all Vietnam narratives are cultural because they are about the aftermath, the representations and stories that continue to flow in the difficult period of adjusting to a lost war and to the millions of people who were lost to it in so many ways. But rather than offer another survey of writings about men at war, which neglects the larger story of the Vietnam War’s aftermath, Ryan focuses on “women’s roles in the Vietnam experience, as well as the anti-war movement…the Vietnamese diaspora, and the larger relationship between the conflict in Vietnam and the social upheavals on the 1960s and ‘70s home front.” (10)

Ryan begins her survey on familiar ground, with the title “MIA in America” that suggests the state of mind that prevailed among many veterans upon returning from the war. Beginning with the fictional Rambo as an early example of the alienated and potentially lethal veteran who is, as the franchise morphed throughout the 1980s, transformed into a hyper-masculine American hero, Ryan moves on to review the standard literature (Tim O’Bryan, Philip Caputo, Michael Herr, Larry Heinemann, and so forth) as well as lesser known narratives. While many of the latter may not demonstrate much in the way of compelling aesthetic literary value, they are nevertheless of interest to Ryan for their “thematic insights” and bring to the fore often overlooked and marginalized narratives. (12) In this way, Ryan tracks through the lived experiences of many of the distinct communities that lived through the war and now live with the war’s aftermath. Further chapters on women writers, POWs, the hippies, anti-war activists, and the Vietnamese exiles are included as voices in what Ryan terms a “Sad Song.” In many ways, the U.S. Vietnamese communities are much like the other lost souls of the Vietnam War, condemned to live in a culture of optimism and future thinking while continually driven back into a haunting past in search of a stable social identity.

Ryan’s book manages to carve out a space for itself within the extensive library of Vietnam War studies where it might be read alongside, for example, *Patriots: The War
Remembered from All Sides (Penguin, 2003). In the contested terrain of the Vietnam War era, however, Ryan’s *The Other Side of Grief* will most certainly garner its share of readers and students.

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Andrew Martin


This earnest paper—not a book really—raises some important issues about the role of artists in war resistance. It asks us to think about where people’s ideas come from, what sustains them as activists, how artists and musicians get their voices heard, and what effects they have on others. While it promises far more than it delivers, if it convinces readers to focus on these issues as they pertain to the 1960s it might encourage a more sophisticated and much needed conversation in the long run.

Markus Jager writes that the aim of his study is “to show that the combination of art and activism plays a significant role in the development of resistance against war” (11). He sets out to use Joan Baez’s activities in relation to the Vietnam War as an example. The problem is that the author does not provide enough context to illustrate the relationship between art and resistance. The focus is on Baez as a lone individual, much admired by the author but not part of a tradition of art and activism that went through a significant shift during the folk revival that began in the late 1950s.

The book is structured around Baez’s life and political activity. We learn about some of the early influences that caused her to become a pacifist. Then, in very short chapters, we are told of her activities including war tax resistance, founding the Institute for the Study of Nonviolence, working in the draft resistance movement during the Vietnam War, singing at Woodstock, traveling to Hanoi, and criticizing the Vietnamese government’s human rights record after the war. In addition, there is brief mention of critics who tried to prevent her from reaching a mass audience, from the CIA to the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Much of this information comes from Baez’s autobiography, which leaves the reader hoping for some deeper insight than she herself provides. Yet the theory is quite thin, relying on tantalizing quotations from David Hadju’s *Positively 4th Street* and the work of Simon Frith and R. Serge Denisoff. Thus, shortly after telling us about Joan Baez signing with Vanguard Records, the author quotes Denisoff saying “finally, traditional and contemporary protest songs, hidden away all these years, caught the attention of a large mass of young people” (30). But there is no discussion of why these songs were “hidden away” or of what it meant to have protest songs become part of popular culture. Indeed, a few pages later the author writes “She was among the first politically active artists . . .” (32). But unless one takes into account the long tradition of protest music in the United States—or just the twentieth century for that matter, from the songs of the Industrial Workers of the World to those of Woody Guthrie, Leadbelly, Pete Seeger and others who paved the way for Joan Baez—she appears as a lone heroine. If we are to deepen our understanding of art and resistance, we need to address hard questions about protest music and popular culture and the importance of community in organizing against war.

Southern Illinois University Carbondale

Robbie Lieberman
Winifred Breines relates a difficult and contested history in The Trouble between Us: An Uneasy History of White and Black Women in the Feminist Movement. She begins by asking why there was no interracial feminist movement, and in the end, illuminates key issues in American social relations and political activism. Breines focuses on key groups and issues, revisiting the politics of gender and sexuality in the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the Black Power Movement and using two Boston organizations, Bread and Roses and the Combahee River Collective, to examine white and black socialist feminisms.

She illuminates the deep appeal of identity politics to white and black feminists at a pivotal moment in United States history. White women and people of color formed the social movements of the 1960s and beyond not only to rectify deep injustices in American society, but also to claim the right to speak with authority about their own lives. When activists tried to work together across differences in race, class, gender, and sexuality, they found that their differences in experiences, resources, and perceptions created almost insurmountable barriers to cooperation.

Identity politics evolved in response to those dilemmas, even as the political mobilization of identities created ongoing problems. White feminists organized consciousness raising groups that profoundly shaped their personal lives and political commitments. Their belief in an ostensibly universal gender system alienated black women, whose challenges were deepened by racism and whose lives did not mirror those of white women in gender socialization or material circumstances. Breines, for example, concludes that white feminism’s critique of patriarchal family relations was “cold” and did not acknowledge the importance of black families as sites of resistance in a racist society. More importantly, black women understood racial justice to be their most pressing political priority.

In response, some black women formed autonomous feminist organizations. According to Breines, this separatism created a highly contentious path to a sometimes workable politics of alliance between black women and white socialist feminists in Boston. Citing the Coalition for Women’s Safety, Breines concludes that when white feminists allowed black women to lead while they provided pragmatic organizational support, issues of race were defused. That arrangement did not translate well in other settings. Feminist workshops devised to address racism in the feminist movement often ended in anger, recriminations, and guilt.

Though she understands that black women’s rage carried with it their anger at their treatment in the society at large, Breines understates the level of dysfunction that sometimes characterized interactions between white feminists and women of color. She rightly concludes that black feminists developed significant analyses of race and gender in their organizations and publications and that white feminists lost the possibilities presented by interracial communication and organization. She fails, however, to explore the closures entailed when black feminists distanced themselves so fully from white feminists. Nonetheless, this is a courageous and insightful book.

University of Arizona

Karen Anderson
Better late than never. César Miguel Rondón’s excellent book on salsa, appropriately entitled *The Book of Salsa*, has finally been translated into English, more than twenty-five years after its initial publication, a welcome development for which we owe immense gratitude to Frances R. Aparicio and her collaborator Jackie White.

It is somewhat ironic that this excellent treatise on a music that grew and developed in the United States was written in Caracas by a brilliant, non-academic Venezuelan writer. To explain how that happened would deviate from our purpose here, but noted it must be.

One of the amazing aspects of Rondón’s text, viewed with the great benefit of hindsight, is precisely how incredibly prescient his analysis of the development of salsa was in 1981 when the music was barely coming into the radar screens of the non-Latino American public. The analytical observations made by Rondón that have stood the test of time, indeed been borrowed by academics in order to further research the history and sociology of salsa, are too numerous to mention in such a short review. A few, however, are obligatory.

In *The Book of Salsa* Rondón identifies the precursors of the salsa genre, pointing to classic Cuban popular music and the “Latin” music that was popular in the United States in the 1940s and 1960s. But Rondón shows the ways in which salsa itself was a new creation that, rather than providing amusement and spectacle, reflected the spirit of the marginal, urban Latino barrios of the United States, in particular New York City. At the same time he is able to provide examples of the continuities between these two stages in the development of a Latino music scene in the United States. Thus, he emphasizes the great debt owed by the new style to the Cuban blind composer and tres player Arsenio Rodriguez whose “way of conceiving, structuring and approaching the son was highly influential and determined the overall sound of salsa.” (50)

Rondón clearly perceived the different approaches to music traditions by the early salsa exponents. On the one hand Eddie Palmieri and Willy Colón pursued the fresher, newer, even avant garde treatment of the music, more toward jazz in the face of the former, more toward the dancing barrio in the latter; on the other hand Harlow and Pacheco stuck closer to the Cuban roots with Ray Barretto acting somewhat as a synthesizer of everything that was happening around him in the world of salsa.

Finally, Rondón demonstrates how this early experimentation and varied menu of musical choices succumbed with the adoption, led by Dominican Johnny Pacheco, of a traditional style closer to the Cuban sound of the 1950s, a choice driven by the imperatives of an industry pursuing the maximization of sales and profit which, sadly, not always coincides with the most innovative music ideas of the moment.

The English translation of Rondón original Spanish text is truly outstanding. For the English edition Rondón provided an exciting, if inevitably far too short, summary of developments in salsa music in the last twenty-five years. Aside from a few minor mistakes, e.g. Tito Rodriguez is identified as a Cuban singer—he’s Puerto Rican, Rondón’s book is an encyclopedia of accurate details and an elegant example of well-grounded generalizations about the salsa story. It belongs in the library of anyone wishing to learn about the history of U.S. Latinos and their music.

Raul Fernandez
Freed of any overarching intellectual agenda, Michael Scully has authored an intelligent labor of love. Like a mature lover, Scully recognizes that the object of his affection is flawed, perhaps irreparably damaged. That object is folk music, the “noncommercial expression of core community identity,” (2) and two organizations that have struggled for decades to commercialize this music without stripping it of its anti-commercial values. Rounder Records, which released its first two albums in 1970, and the Folk Alliance, founded in 1989 as a quasi-industry organization devoted to the promotion of folk music performers, presenters, and recording labels, began as relatively idealistic outgrowths of the “folk boom” of the 1950s and 1960s. These organizations inherited from that boom the leftist recognition that music can be a primary means of articulating the central values of a community along with the romantic idea that those values, in order to remain authentic, must avoid any compromise with market demands. Scully traces the efforts of these two organizations as they worked through many of the consequences of their founding contradiction.

Building on in-depth interviews with the owners and employees of Rounder, Scully tells the story of three idealistic college students who found their lives transformed by the upheavals of the sixties and also found the beauties of folk music to be the most powerful voices singing the meaning of those upheavals. Beginning as a completely fan-owned and owner-operated organization, Rounder soon discovered that servicing a market meant more than recording, pressing and selling copies of the music they loved. Demands placed by stores for regularly available product met the demands of musicians who could never breach the wall of intimacy and commitment that bound together the founders. Confronted by an almost inevitable class division within the company, the three original Rounders were shocked by the fact that their employees had developed different interests and goals and looked to traditional union organizing as a means to further those interests and achieve those goals. The Rounders had become the bosses—simply as a consequence of their success at producing and marketing the music they loved, the music of “the people.”

The story that Scully tells about the Folk Alliance is not as deep nor as richly ironic. Powered by the intense not-for-profit drive of vernacular music enthusiasts, this organization carried with it not only the idealism described above but also an immersion in the urgent necessities of regularly producing folk music concerts and recordings in the era of Reagan. As a national organization, the Folk Alliance needed to work with a wide range of different needs and motivations among its members. Some wanted only to promote the most pure examples of non-commercial everyday music-making. Others wanted nothing more than to hitch their ride to (or even become) the next Dar Williams.

With care and grace, Scully details the power struggles, the hirings and resignations, the handwringing and public denunciations that characterize any organization that tries to blend notions of cultural purity with commercial ambitions. This book is well researched and, in general, well written. It conveys with dignity the love of folk music that animated these organizations and the sad consequences of the perhaps inescapable contradictions that gave birth to that romance.

Ohio State University

Barry Shank

With analytic precision and amiable prose, Mary Patillo renders a poignant portrait of our modern urban times with her latest work *Black on the Block*. The project claims to examine the general politics of blackness amidst turn-of-the-twentieth-century struggles over the city. But I think it would be fair to argue that this is an extension of her first major work *Black Picket Fences*, now examining the issues at stake when black middle men and women mediate the development of “black community” amidst the dominant neo-liberal logic of our urban times.

At the center of analysis stands Chicago’s south side community of North Kenwood Oakland (NKO). Patillo takes us through its historical arc from an urban space of Whites-only fortification to one of Black blight and violence. While now the space is “re-discovered” as a “new frontier” of increasingly rich market value in economically austere times. While Black middle and upper-income “newcomers” to NKO do settle in the neighborhood because of the relatively inexpensive real estate, Patillo warns that this is not a story of economic determinism. They not only stay but redirect resources and model a set of respectable behaviors to underprivileged residents because of a particular sense of race pride and duty. Moreover, Patillo adds that rather than being two nations, one bourgie and one stuck at the bottom, it is precisely divergent class interests and disagreements about the meaning of shared public space, streets, housing, education, and commerce etc, that “constitute[s] the black community” (3).

Patillo offers an amazing blend of historical context, light ethnography, and urban policy analysis combined with some of the latest spatial and racial theory available. Here the social experience of class organizes black community. But Patillo pulls on pioneering sociological works like *Black Metropolis* to expand the meaning of class to “lifestyle,” where aspirations and consumption habits cut across the variables of income and inherited wealth. Chapters in the body of *Black on the Block* deploy the fulcrum of lifestyle to examine blackness situated within the neighborhood struggles and interests over key social institutions in NKO.

The power of analysis lies in Patillo’s dynamic interweaving of intraracial struggles and larger municipal and economic forces to render a contemporary portrait of Black community. These middle men and women serve as the blackface of capitalist interests and the black race arbiters of resource redistribution downward to benefit the “truly disadvantaged.” For instance the reform initiative of school “choice,” with their competition-based marketing of selective enrollment and small class size to student-clients, has principally brought better education to the central city. But at the same time, the market model of “shopping” for schools has enacted exclusionary outcomes by expecting parents to be industrious consumers with the time and networks available to connect them with information about the best educational commodities. She also considers how public housing removal confirms fears about gentrification’s single family/high property value model squeezing out the less fortunate. But it also expresses a race conscious resistance against the historic Jim Crowing of citywide public housing onto the south side. Finally, as land value becomes a central issue for community value, the very meaning of crime and danger shift from drug dealing, homicides, and robberies to loud music, parkway barbeques, and other acts of public sociability.

In the end, *Black on the Block* powerfully captures some of the “difference, distinction, and sometimes even dislike” in present-day formations of urban blackness, while demonstrating how such dynamics remain organized around some version, no matter how
fractured, of racial responsibility. As a self-described participant observer, resident, and political actor in the NKO, this sympathetic portrait of “middleness” is in many ways a portrait of Patillo. I for one appreciate her candor in this endeavor that never veers too far into self-aggrandizement while providing further nuance and balance to E. Franklin Frazier’s still dominant caricature of the black middle class.

This work had the potential to expand the insights of Sudhir Vinkatesh, by exploring how the “corner boys,” “street walkers,”—the “truly disadvantaged”—viewed the black bourgeoisie, how the informal economy of the “underclass” may be in conversation with, even overlap with, the vaulted “middle.” However, we receive a relatively fixed portrait of the Black middle class as a race inclusive yet class interested agent of transformation. But we hear little about how they are transformed by the urban world that pre-dated their “re-entry.” In the end, Black on the Block further confirms Mary Patillo as the now, not the future, of urban studies and anyone who claims expertise or even interest in the metropolis must seriously grapple with her work.

Boston College 

Davarian Baldwin


The study of television has been complicated by the changing climate of the media industries and of American culture, as the fragmentation of audiences, the development of new delivery systems, and the dynamics of social and political life affect the economic, technological, and cultural place of television. The Essential HBO Reader situates the advertiser-free format and boundary-pushing content of premium cable network HBO at the center of such shifts.

Keeping HBO’s role as a business in sight, editors Gary R. Edgerton and Jeffrey P. Jones structure their analysis of HBO around its programming, which they break down into four categories: drama, comedy, sports, and documentaries, with contributors offering detailed analyses of specific programs within each. Following Edgerton’s introduction (a general industrial history of the network), each section begins with an overview chapter highlighting a more specific history and pertinent issues for the genre at hand. A final section offers reflections on the network as a whole, one chapter considering representations of women and the other dissecting the network’s key legacies, satisfyingly concluding this comprehensive work of television criticism.

Because Edgerton and Jones offer such a thorough treatment of HBO’s programming, their volume is a useful addition to a growing number of books about American television in the “post-network” era. It also offers some strong examples of critical reflection on television texts. Chapters such as David Thorburn’s critique of The Sopranos and Thomas Schatz’s analysis of Band of Brothers isolate specific textual features to make insightful points not only about those programs, but also about their place within the HBO pantheon and within film and TV storytelling more generally. Also useful are those chapters that take on older, or less well-known, examples, such as Tanner ’88 or HBO’s erotic documentaries. The individual chapters make their most significant contributions when they place HBO’s output in industrial or cultural context, as does Christopher Anderson’s sharp analysis of how HBO programming has achieved the status of art.

Alongside such highlights are some missteps, as may be inevitable in a collection of this size. The collection’s chief weakness becomes clear during Toby Miller and Linda J. Kim’s overview of HBO Sports. This chapter is welcome, in that it is one of the only entries to critically examine the political economy of HBO, even if it is not as well
supported by evidence as it might be. Its challenging tone brings into sharp relief the other chapters’ near-uniform praise for HBO, and their general lack of attention to how the network’s economic model may shape or constrain its output in less than desirable ways. The book’s celebratory perspective is unnecessary, at best, and troubling, at worst, given the already effusive praise heaped upon the network by journalistic critics, the TV industry, and HBO’s own promotions. While the products of the post-network era may break free of some of the limitations of advertiser-supported broadcast television, television scholars need not abandon a more critical stance in our enthusiasm for the greater diversity of programming now before us.

University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

Elana Levine


The Association for the Advancement of Creative Musicians has made one of the most important institutional contributions to American music of the twentieth century. Formed in 1965 and in continuous operation since, the AACM has provided an organizational framework that is always in process, always the product of multiple struggles, always connected to its neighborhood(s), and always the incubator of creative music. Always? That makes it all sound too easy. One of the great achievements of George Lewis’s monumental genealogy (roll over, Foucault) of “The AACM and American Experimental Music” is that it avoids the temptation of a whiggish approach where the legacy of the institution and its movement was set in stone by a few early brilliant founders only to develop in its inevitability through the following years. Instead, Lewis gives us a much more complicated picture of the tensions, disruptions, and out- and-out fights that accompanied every step of its history. The AACM was never guaranteed of success, and, indeed, when one considers the institution’s goals, both audacious and grounded, and established during its initial meetings, one must be amazed at the level of success the organization achieved. Each of the nine goals combines musical, philosophical and material concerns. Each displays the organization’s philosophical dedication to the mutual generative responsibilities of individuality and collective commitment. Goals five, six, and nine demonstrate the complexity of the association’s understanding of the lives of musicians: “To provide a source of employment for worthy creative musicians;” “To set an example of high moral standards for musicians to uplift the public image of creative musicians;” “To stimulate spiritual growth in creative artists through recitals, concerts, etc., through participation in programs.” (118) Together those three goals articulate the interconnectedness of musicianship, artistry, public image, material success and personal integrity that characterized the highest aspirations of the organization. Much of Lewis’s book is devoted to describing the efforts of the AACM to reach and sustain these goals.

Lewis’s book is personal yet methodologically rigorous. He draws on his own history with an investment in the group supplemented by an academic’s professional orientation to historical accuracy and ethnographic authority. Indeed, Lewis seems to have set out to correct many of the myths that have grown up around the AACM by a thorough interrogation of both documentary sources and extensive interviews. First, the Chicago originators did not draw their musical style directly and solely from Sun Ra. Like many post-WWII musicians, their sound derived from a wide variety of “Great Black Music”—from Louis Armstrong through Charlie Parker and Ornette Coleman but also including William Grant Still and James Reece Europe. Lewis points out, however, that the organization constantly battled the jazz tradition of linking current performers to great individual precursors and
the corresponding tendency to write jazz history as a set of stories of great individuals. Instead, Lewis insists that the AACM wanted to emphasize current connections among individuals and their multiple communities and sought to include as wide a variety as possible of great sounds among their influences. Second, the AACM was not a black nationalist organization. They were committed to their own autonomy as artists and as entrepreneurs. They were committed to promoting great black music. Their roots in the black community and the Great Migration ran deep. Their knowledge of the history of white exploitation of black creative efforts was extensive. But their understanding of the keywords: “great;” “black;” and “music” were nuanced, complicated, and the result of years of disagreement, compromise, and actual real world practice. (Boy, did these folks practice.) In Lewis’s analysis, the AACM developed a theory of black music that was not limited to the traditional genres of jazz, blues and r&b, and was not simply defined by the racial identity of the performers. Great black music could be performed by musicians with any racial identity, so long as the music could be recognized as such. (This requirement did beg the question of who was authorized to legitimate the recognition.) Furthermore, this music need not be improvised or funky or dance-oriented. It could be notated, severe and cerebral. And it could be improvised, funky and dance-oriented. At the same time, musicians like Anthony Braxton, Muhal Richard Abrams and Roscoe Mitchell were not simply grafting jazz instrumentation and improvisational techniques onto pan-European musical strategies. They were investigating and experimenting with music in the pursuit of the material, philosophical, and artistic goals of the organization.

Despite its massive achievements, the book is not without its gaps and weaknesses. One chapter near the end deals with problems of gender that haunted the group from the beginning. Isolating these concerns in this way is efficient for the author and makes for a logical organization. But it has the (presumably undesired) effect of seeming to absolve the AACM of this problematic aspect of its history. Lewis’s personal history with the organization results in a tendency to include the names of hundreds of musicians in list after list of performers at this anniversary or that festival. The effort at inclusion is consistent with the organization’s eschewal of the great performer tradition, but the names loose force in their repetition. Finally, after all the tremendous work that Lewis has done to compile, organize and write this extensive and far-reaching history, I would have liked more critical engagement with the recorded legacy of the Art Ensemble of Chicago, Anthony Braxton, Roscoe Mitchell, Leroy Jenkins, Muhal Richard Abrams, and the rest. Perhaps it was too difficult for Lewis to write critically about his companions in the struggle. If so, I am grateful for that, for it leaves some work for the rest of us.

Ohio State University

Barry Shank


How do we remember the Civil Rights Movement? How do we commemorate the Civil Rights Movement? What narratives of the Movement become sanctioned in the public sphere? Geographers Dwyer and Alderman address these questions and reveal the complexities of their answers in their latest book project on civil rights memorials. Their text interrogates case studies of civil rights memorials across the nation with overarching questions about the significance of marking landmarks of the Movement and meticulous discussions of the multiple perspectives involved in the support of and resistance to creating civil rights memorials.
The Introduction lays out the emotional and economic conflicts of creating a legitimized space of memory in a case that recurs throughout the text: the renaming of Ninth Street in Chattanooga, Tennessee to Martin Luther King, Jr. Street. White business owners’ and investors’ fears of being associated with a “Black” street brought threats of withdrawing funds from cultivating new businesses on the street. Black community leaders insisted that King worked for all communities, not just Black ones, and therefore should be honored even in a place where Whites worked. Further, Black leadership argued that White protest of the renaming hurt the potential for new businesses along the street by creating a hostile environment for investors. The solution was to split the street so that part was renamed and the other remained Ninth Street. In addition, White own businesses changed their addresses to adjacent streets, avoiding their association with King. This resolve demonstrates the anxieties over the commemoration of the Movement leader and unveiled the limits of consensus regarding the significance and value of King as a synecdochical figure for the Movement.

Chapter 1 analyzes the stories told through civil rights memorials. The authors pay particular attention to the interpretation of the Movement at commemorative sites and narratives that have been omitted from them. Chapter 2 discusses the financial realities involved in creating civil rights memorials that range from physical markers to create an official landmark to renaming a street. Chapter 3 addresses where civil rights memorials are dispersed around the country and the meaning of their locations and absences in significant places.

The most meaningful contribution of the text is the level of consideration of the memorials which are often regarded as heritage tourist sites. The ritual of visiting museums, parks, churches and the like that have become iconic places in the national collective memory of the Movement is contextualized and deconstructed. After reading the authors’ analyses, these memorials can no longer be taken for granted as places that mark the Movement’s success, but instead are historicized as evidence of the contentious contemporary struggle for racial equity that extends into our present moment. Their comprehensive investigation—which incorporates approaches from Cultural Studies, American Studies, American History, Art History, as well as Geography—make the book relevant to readers and scholars of multiple disciplines. The text includes a gallery of seventy-eight civil rights memorials with annotated captions that provide the history, and often contentious issues, of each illustrated site in a nutshell. This feature makes the book a necessary traveling companion to the places discussed.

University of California, Irvine

Bridget R. Cooks


Over the past several years, Michael Messner has established himself among the two or three most perceptive scholars on the sociology of American sports. A feminist, Messner has shown sensitivity to issues of power and the ways in which sports at various levels affect attitudes and behavior. His new book extends these analyses by examining the intersection between gender, coaching, and community in American youth sports—soccer and baseball/softball—in the suburbs of Pasadena, California. As both a data collector and participant observer over seven years, Messner provides provocative insights into the ways that in the post-Title IX era gender dynamics, with most coaching and administrative responsibilities assumed by men and “team mom” supportive roles assumed by women, hinder rather than facilitate gender equity.
The book is a treat in the way that it methodically reviews the “pipeline” of how coaches and team moms are recruited, the differing experiences of male and female coaches—a gender-sorting process that distinguishes between “kid knowledge” and “sports knowledge”—, and the ways in which gender roles of adults in suburban Pasadena youth sports reflect broader inequalities that exist in communities. Messner adapts from the scholarship of others and divides concepts into categories that make his analysis understandable to experts and lay readers alike. He identifies, for example, four trends that explain the recent surge in youth sports participation, four styles of coaching, three “shifts” in a mother’s daily life, and more. Perhaps most provocatively, Messner asserts that the American middle-class, suburban ideology is dominated by a “soft essentialism,” whereby women in post-feminist and society believe that they have choices in their career and family roles when in fact a culturally constructed gendered belief system still views husbands’ careers as primary while defining household and child-raising responsibilities, at which men are considered inept, as women’s “natural” talents. Women are not involuntarily confined to domestic roles; rather, they believe that they choose such roles freely because they are best for the kids. Thus, youth league coaching roles mirror what Messner calls the “hegemonic work family form.”

Messner alludes to the phrase “it’s all for the kids” is “mildly sarcastic,” evoking self-conscious chortles from adult volunteers. But he does not address the actual irony of the book’s title. The complex organized activity of soccer and baseball leagues exists because parents assume that their children cannot and should not do things for themselves, and Messner’s interviews and vignettes reveal that the coaching and support functions satisfy adult needs as much as they assist the kids. There are no children’s voices in the analysis, no sense of whether or not a team mom’s fussing over snacks or a “drill sergeant” coach is appreciated or resented. Messner aptly points out how concerns over safety drive adult-supervised sports today, but there was a time, not so long ago and no safer, when youngster would have been embarrassed if their parents showed up at a game that kids considered to be an independent activity free from an adult’s intrusive eyes. The fact that adults feel that they must take control of this activity suggests that more than gender dynamics are involved.

Brown University

Howard P. Chudacoff


Nothing makes a young man feel old faster than reading a book that dwells primarily on the “history” of the 1980s and 90s. At least for me, this is particularly true when the history in question is the history of conflict between LGBT Americans and members of the right-wing under the past four presidential administrations. After all, for many people, including myself, these conflicts—conflicts that political scientist Craig A. Rimmerman seeks to put in some historical perspective in his new book—still have an overwhelming sense of ongoingness about them. Nevertheless, Rimmerman is arguably justified in stepping back a bit to ask “How much progress have the lesbian and gay movements made over the years in achieving larger movements’ goals?” and “What political organizing strategies are the most effective, and which are the least effective?” (xi). As the book’s interrogative title suggests, Rimmerman’s answer to these important questions begins with an acknowledgement that the LGBT movements, as the author pluralistically refers to them, have themselves vacillated between two ideological dispositions: a desire to win equal inclusion within American society as it is, and a more confrontational drive to upend
fundamentally the gender and sexual normativity that underwrites homophobic antipathy in the United States. Somewhat reductively, Rimmerman lumps these impulses under the descriptors “assimilationist” and “liberationist” respectively, and then proceeds to weigh and consider their relative merits and demerits as political strategies within the context of four historical case studies: the homophile and gay liberation movements of the 1950s and 1960s, debates surrounding the formulation and implementation of HIV/AIDS policy during the 1980s and 1990s, the controversy over gays in the military that erupted when President Clinton announced that he would end the ban during his first campaign for the White House, and the rancorous squabble over gay marriage that is currently raging today. Ultimately, Rimmerman politely advocates what he calls “a dual organizing strategy, one that builds on the best of the assimilationist perspective, but one that also considers the possibilities for more radical, liberationist, structural, social and policy change” (147). As concluding recommendations go this one is certainly tidy, optimistic, and just about as even-handed as they come. But it also seems rather hollow given the fact that he has just spent almost a hundred and fifty pages demonstrating that these competing impulses began to emerge almost sixty years ago and have been with us, to one extent or another, ever since. Fortunately, there is much to recommend this book other than its argument, such as it is. Among other things, Rimmerman offers readers a detailed yet admirably concise survey of most of the major political and legislative skirmishes that have surrounded lesbians and gay men in the United States over the past half century. This alone makes the book a valuable resource for anyone wanting to inject some official political history into gender or LGBT studies courses—courses which often tend to huddle exclusively around “culture” as the proper domain of analysis. Additionally, Rimmerman’s book also contains a nicely chosen collection of supplementary materials for which any teacher will undoubtedly be grateful. Along with chapter specific discussion questions, the book includes a glossary of terms, a relatively detailed timeline chronicling major events during the first twenty-five years of the HIV/AIDS pandemic, the exact language of the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” law, and the names, telephone numbers, and website addresses for major U.S. LGBT organizations and advocacy groups associated with the Christian right. In other words, The Lesbian and Gay Movements: Assimilation or Liberation? is a volume that was quite obviously written to be taught—in undergraduate LGBT history courses, in courses dealing with the history of civil rights movements in the United States, and in courses that examine sexuality and American public policy. Readers who turn to Rimmerman’s book with this purpose in mind will undoubtedly be pleased with much of what they find there.

Indiana University, Bloomington

Colin R. Johnson


In God Hates Fags, Michael Cobb argues that anti-gay rhetoric steeped in conservative Christian values provides queer theory with new opportunities for development. Cobb’s basic idea recalls the familiar minority strategy of adopting denigrating, mainstream put-downs as self-descriptors—Black, Chicano, and Queer itself come immediately to mind. But Cobb, an English professor at the University of Toronto, grounds his argument in literary theory which he uses to frame gay-related political and policy debates, analyses of Supreme Court cases, and the interpretation of fiction and non-fiction. His central point is that, however dire circumstances appear to be given events like the brutal murder of Matthew Shepard and the political influence of homophile lobbies like Focus on the
Family, the time is ripe for queer theorists to respond creatively to religious anti-gay hate speech to create new openings in American public discourse for the GLBTQ community.

In several critical steps, Cobb establishes his interpretive logic. He first argues that religious anti-gay hate speech is in the tradition of the Puritan jeremiad. In post 9/11 America, it is a language of national security that seeks to buttress the nation’s moral unity by identifying the GLBTQ community as enemy, a rhetoric Cobb sees as the dominant discourse of America’s civil orthodoxy today. He then evokes Giorgio Agamben’s homo sacer, a religiously ambiguous figure originally found in Roman law whose exile, taboo status lends him a numinous power, a posture Cobb claims for the queer theorist. Having laid out a power-in-the-margin argument, Cobb then devotes most of the book to mining writers from James Baldwin and Tennessee Williams to Dorothy Allison and Jacob Riis for rhetorical strategies they used to combat oppressive class, racial, and sexual orthodoxies and to carve out social and existential space for those deemed deviant. Cobb sees these strategies as arming the queer theorist whose role is to take up a comparable task today.

This summary makes the argument sounds sleeker than it is, and much of the book’s appeal is that Cobb mixes theoretical reflection with an urgent personal voice. He is also fond of digressing whether into nuanced implications of court decisions or the creativity of Christians in crafting gay-hating theological arguments. A thorny issue Cobb returns to repeatedly is the “like race” argument—that hatred and oppression of gays makes their minority status like, but not the same as, that of African-Americans. Cobb is very explicit about not seeking to subsume race into queer theory, but his sensitivity to the charge suggests this is a hot button issue among critical theorists, who are sure to have fine-tuned responses to his arguments. For general readers, however, God Hates Fags is a excellent way to become immersed in the issues and rhetorical arguments of a sub-cultural world of American religious and political discourse.

Hamilton College

Richard Hughes Seager


Few American film directors can make claims to working primarily as an auteur, that is, as the author, artist, and director of a film, but this term applies to Spike Lee’s career in film and the cinema. In his early career, Lee authored, directed, and acted in approximately one film every one-to-two years since his directorial debut She’s Gotta Have It in 1986. A graduate of New York University film school, the industry and moviegoers know Lee for his provocative narratives about African American culture and life. A few critical anthologies exist on the director’s work, and Lee has co-authored, with Village Voice writer Lisa Jones, production-oriented books published simultaneously with his earlier films. However, as Lee’s film repertoire grows, there remains much to say about the meanings and impact of his body of work. Paula Massood’s The Spike Lee Reader accomplishes this task.

The Spike Lee Reader includes new and several well-known pieces previously published about Lee’s work. The previously published pieces work seamlessly with the newer additions. These pieces provide a foundation to remind readers of the discourse established in response to the first decade of his career concerning representations of gender, sexuality, and class. The remainder of the edited collection includes analyses of Lee’s more recent films that are lesser examined in critical scholarship. Essays on Lee’s documentary work Four Little Girls (1997) and lesser acknowledged films such as the basketball film He Got Game (1998), the half-thriller half-comedy Summer of Sam
(1999), the minstrel parody *Bamboostled* (2000), and the refreshingly complex bank heist adventure *Inside Man* (2006), for example, present interdisciplinary methods for looking at Lee’s cinematic and narrative accomplishments. Authors in this anthology draw from music, performance, television, material culture, and literature to address a broad range of issues concerning Lee’s work, including film as an aspect of historical discourse, racial performance, and audience reception. In her overall assessment of Lee’s work over the past three decades, Massood situates Spike Lee as a director who creates “textual systems employing . . . allusion, and homage [which] explore[s] the shared national trauma of racism and its continuing social, economic, and political affects” (xxiii). It is this characterization of Lee’s work as being relevant in terms of representational politics and race relations that has come to define the canon of his work for audiences and critics.

The collection begins with feminist interpretations of films *She’s Gotta Have It, School Daze* (1988), and *Do The Right Thing* (1989), by cultural critics bell hooks, Michelle Wallace, and Wahneema Lubiano, respectively. The latter writings gave birth to some of the most quoted and critical ideas about Lee’s work. hooks’ presents the persuasive argument that *She’s Gotta Have It* does not constitute a feminist narrative because the lead protagonist does not own her sexuality. Wallace exposes Lee’s pattern to use Black female humiliation as plot resolution. Lubiano includes a keen observation concerning Lee’s rigid and essentialist Black cultural politics in *Do The Right Thing* and *School Daze*. Taken together, hooks, Wallace, and Lubiano remind readers of the representative fallout from Lee’s quest to rebuild the image of African American life on screen through a masculinist and neo-nationalist lens. Anna Everett in “Spike, Don’t Mess Malcolm Up,” recognizes this problem in the film *Malcolm X* (1992), where she notes that the various stages of X’s life are depicted with visual complexity and nuance in the film, while Black women remain couched within a troubling discourse of inadequacy.

Comparatively, Craig S. Watkins’ “Reel Men,” which focuses on Lee’s *Get On the Bus*, illustrates the director’s ability to attend to the diversity of gender representation when Lee is representing African American men. *Get On the Bus*, which is a fictional depiction of a group of diverse Black men who decide to attend the historic Million Man March, was a box office failure, but its mixture of documentary style filmmaking and stylized lighting, color, and eclectic music made it an aesthetic success. In addition to addressing masculinity and aesthetics, Watkins’ piece deals with significant issues concerning the market and film production; he includes the ongoing problem that Lee faces, despite his longevity and success, when trying to garner financial support for his more substantive projects. In particular, the director continues to struggle with finicky moviegoers’ hunger for a rigid brand of urban cinema and large motion picture companies who Lee believes encourages these tastes. As Lee espouses in an interview that Watkins quotes from another source, the popularity of African American urban crime dramas—a genre outside the scope of Lee’s vision—is “disturbing because studio heads are looking at these numbers.” Lee continues, “the next time a black filmmaker tries to make a film with any substance, [and seeks funding for it, studio heads will] say, ‘Well the last time somebody tried a film like *Get On the Bus* nobody came’” (157). These market pulls have no doubt encouraged Lee to enter into a space where substance may trump the market, and that is, documentary filmmaking.

In Christine’s Acham’s “We Shall Overcome,” she argues that Lee’s documentary *Four Little Girls* serves as an important aspect of re-membering civil rights through the lives of everyday people. The documentary chronicles the 1963 bombing of a black church in Birmingham, AL, which led to the death of four young African American girls. Lee’s work not only places a face on this atrocity, but it also doubles as contemporary
commentary on how far race relations have come: *Four Little Girls* was released in 1997, which was during the same time that a series of black church bombings occurred across the U.S. Acham attests to the relevancy of the documentary as a teaching tool, because it allows students to realize how the social relations that informs past events remain a part of our present historical moment. A documentary of Lee’s not addressed in essay form in this collection, but which Acham mentions in brief, *When the Levees Broke* (2006), is cited as being equally useful in its ability to make historical linkages to present struggles concerning race and class. The book’s attention to Lee’s documentary work augments discussion of his more popular materials, and it shows the potentially different impact the two forms (i.e., popular and documentary filmmaking) may yield.

Beretta Smith-Shomade makes a complementary argument to Acham’s in her explication of Lee’s historical engagement with blackface minstrelsy in *Bamboozled*, which is a film that parodies the television industry and its executives who thrive and survive off selling post-modern blackface to television audiences. Her provocatively tongue and cheek titled essay, “I Be Smackin’ My Hoes,” explores the film’s question pertaining to how contemporary popular culture reifies the caricatures in blackface minstrelsy and sells it to eager audiences and consumers. “*Bamboozled,*” writes Smith-Shomade, “requires audiences to look at the past and present as mirrors of one another,” by showing how “blackface (already false constructions) returns according to Lee in contemporary television” (241). Comparatively, in Tavia Nyong’o’s “Racial Kitsch and Black Performance,” she describes this mirroring effect in *Bamboozled* as a dialectical relationship between performers and audiences in the film. Both camps, she writes, revisit the double injustice of slavery and racism through their performance or consumption of contemporary “minstrelized iconography” (222).

David Gerstner’s “De Profundis: A Love Letter From the Inside Man,” is a nice bookend to the anthology. Gerstner suggests that motion picture company executives made Spike Lee’s connection to the film *Inside Man* secondary to the promotion of the film’s ability to secure critically acclaimed actors such as Denzel Washington, Jodie Foster, and Clive Owen. This strategy of executives, he contends, encouraged the idea that unlike Lee’s former films, *Inside Man* did not contain a racial or polarizing narrative. Thus, the luring of moviegoers occurred under the auspices that the film was merely an action adventure-packed bank heist extravaganza, only to reveal upon screening that its suspenseful narrative was in actuality about modern racism, anti-Semitism, and capitalist greed. Gerster leaves readers with the critical task of considering the uses of heightening the artistry of a film by downplaying the Spike Lee brand of filmmaking moviegoers have come to expect.

*The Spike Lee Reader* is a necessary addition to the library of researchers and scholars in film and cultural studies. It is also a theoretically rich, interdisciplinary text that will be of use for upper division undergraduate and graduate courses on film, popular culture, and Ethnic Studies. Indeed, having recently taught the anthology in an upper-division undergraduate African American culture and cinema course composed of ½ film majors and ½ American Studies majors, students expressed that the book provided a well-balanced integration of cultural, historical, and aesthetic analysis. These components of the book, they shared in open discussion, augmented their understanding of race, the cinema, and the more critical aspects of Lee’s filmmaking for which they were unfamiliar. Whether as a learning tool or as an object of cultural criticism, Spike Lee remains the most visible African American director with a wealth of cultural capital concerning how African American imagery and race issues are viewed in the United States. Massood’s critical anthology asserts his importance, and it is successful in teasing out the filmmaker’s cul-
tural blind spots, filmic accomplishments, and his ability to make political interventions through the visual apparatus of the silver screen.

University of Iowa

Deborah Elizabeth Whaley


The introduction to this slender book sketches out a cogent and important argument. Holloway suggests that the near truism that 9/11 was a day when “everything changed,” a day that that created a “historical rupture” in the recent fabric of America, was in fact freighted with political and geo-political implications that help justify the war on terror and mask substantial continuities in post-Cold War American imperialism. Unhappily, much of this argument gets lost in the body of the text.

The first two chapters provide intellectual and political context and background through an examination of major critics and defenders of the “clash of civilizations” thesis and the related idea of a post-Cold War “American Empire”—Huntington, Ferguson, Ignatieff, Bacevich, Paul Kennedy, Chalmers Johnson, and others—followed by a look at how these ideas actually played out in the halls of power of the Bush administration, shaping the “unitary executive” thesis and eventually the main components of the war on terror: the Bush Doctrine, the Iraq War, Guantanamo, Abu Ghraib, and the rest.

The remaining chapters cover the “culture” side of things, looking at treatments of 9/11 and the war on terror in the mass media, movies, novels, and the visual arts. Not surprisingly, given his previous work, the visual arts chapter is the most original and successful. The chapter on the mass media focuses heavily on the media’s uncritical early acceptance of the Bush administration’s self-serving understanding and presentation of the post 9/11 world. The treatment of movies and novels feels thin and unfocused, with an idiosyncratic and seemingly haphazard selection of often mediocre works that doesn’t always contribute much to the thesis, discussions of movies such as The Alamo, M. Night. Shyamalan’s The Village, The Kingdom of Heaven, or the television series Lost being cases in point.

Holloway has produced a useful introduction to a particular slice of American culture during the Age of Bush II, but too often promising themes dissipate into relatively isolated and disjointed essays. Especially in the second half of the book, the individual parts do not add up to a significant whole. It is perhaps caviling to complain about academic language and disciplinary jargon that have become common custom, but approaching matters such as the war on terror and torture as forms of “representation,” “rhetorical constructions,” or “a series of stories” (4) constructed by the politically powerful has the inadvertent effect of denigrating or even obfuscating serious subject matter.

Overall, this is a worthwhile interdisciplinary attempt to shed light on a complex, controversial topic that is still very much in flux. Holloway deserves significant credit for taking on a challenging endeavor, but we can also hope and expect that better and more substantial successors will soon be available.

Wayne State College

Kent Blaser


Sociologist and demographer John Iceland has examined the residential assimilation of immigrants in a number of journal articles published in the American Sociological
Review, Social Science Research, Demography, and other major journals. His new book draws heavily on those articles in an investigation of the residential segregation patterns of immigrants. Relying primarily on 1990 and 2000 census long-form data, Iceland looks at whether immigrants are assimilating residually, whether the assimilation process differs for immigrants of varying racial and ethnic backgrounds, how characteristics such as English ability and socioeconomic level affect residential assimilation or segregation, how immigration may be re-shaping the segregation patterns of native-born blacks and whites, and at how diversity affects the stability of neighborhoods and the quality of relationships within neighborhoods.

Iceland finds indications of the growing residential assimilation of immigrants. The residential segregation from whites of native born Asians, Hispanics, and Blacks is less than the segregation of foreign born members of those groups. As members of minority groups achieve upward mobility, moreover, they tend to become less segregated from whites. Nevertheless, he finds that there are multiple forms of residential assimilation. Hispanics are drawing closer in their housing to both non-Hispanic whites and to African Americans and the segregation of native from foreign born Hispanics and of Hispanics across racial groups remains low. Finally, Iceland finds that race and ethnicity continue to shape the rate and extent of assimilation, despite the general trends of lessening segregation. Based on these findings, he suggests that immigration may be contributing to a general blurring of the color line in the United States. He recommends some caution about predicting the future, though, since the economic and social situation of the U.S. may change. To that caveat one may add that speculating about long-term trends requires long-term data. Still, none of the findings are surprising or counterintuitive, so Iceland’s observations and predictions may be fairly safe.

Although Iceland identifies some of the major theories of immigrant incorporation and offers some remarks on how his findings may fit those theories, the work is mainly empirical. Readers looking for new theoretical insights into immigration and residential segregation or for original critical discussions of existing theories will not find them here. The work is probably also not appropriate for most undergraduate classes, since it tends to be rather dry and technical, despite the author’s efforts to turn findings from journal articles into a book by including occasional anecdotes from newspapers and other sources. The chapters do not simply reproduce the author’s earlier journal pieces, but the collection as a whole still gives the impression of a collection of separate articles that consider residential segregation from different angles. However, the volume will be useful to specialists in the study of immigration, race, and ethnicity because it brings together a great deal of solid evidence on contemporary residential patterns.

Tulane University

Carl L. Bankston III


It is evident from the introduction that Homegirls is an extraordinary book. Norma Mendoza-Denton opens her linguistic ethnography of young female gang members in California with a series of letters to the various audiences which she hopes to address, ranging from professional linguists to undergraduate students and general readers. The epistolary form establishes a paradox that serves the book well: Mendoza-Denton is ambitious enough to hope that her work might change the way a wide range of readers think, and at the same time harbors no illusions that any intellectual project can capture the rich complexity of human language and culture, even within a very specific field of
focus. Indeed, the core argument of the book is that the group it represents carries on a densely layered cultural life that is misunderstood in stereotype and too much social science as merely a symptom of social pathology and acultural deviance.

Given the long histories of moral panic around Latino/a gangs in the U.S., this representation of cultural integrity might seem a tough sell. In asserting the argument, Mendoza-Denton has almost written two books. The first is an evocatively narrated, reflexive, and critical ethnography of the everyday cultural practices and discourse of the homegirls. This emerges in the early, more interpretive chapters, which will be of wide, general interest for the urgent relevance of the cultural critique they present. For instance, Mendoza-Denton depicts the California schools’ evaluation of English fluency as biased, and often largely non-linguistic, revealing with devastating clarity the systematic elimination of many capable Latino/a students from pursuing university studies. Elsewhere, she describes how members use the identity markers of language to navigate “Norte” and “Sur” (north and south) gang networks, displaying or concealing various fluencies for specific rhetorical purposes. This account of multilingual mastery among high school students complicates the highly political issue of what it means to speak Spanish or English in the United States.

The motivation to unpack these rich instances of social communication lies in Mendoza-Denton’s ethnographic commitment to take the points of view of her subjects seriously; her linguistic approach enables her to do so in outstanding detail. The second part of the book establishes the credibility of her arguments as linguistic science by shifting from the contextual and more generally cultural questions of the first part to a much more specifically linguistic and quantitative study. It is here that some of the anticipated broad audience, even those with access to an International Phonetic Alphabet cheat-sheet, may begin to find the prose growing drier. The critical voice that resonates in the interpretive chapters stands down in favor of more scientific aims: to map structure, and to chart and predict change. Thus humanist readers may begin to lose interest just as the linguists sigh “Finally!”

Homegirls should rock the very foundations of criminological understandings of gangs, especially concerning female gang members. If scientific rigor increases the book’s impact, no one should begrudge Mendoza-Denton the specialization of the latter chapters. In any case, this is a book about much more than language—or perhaps it reveals language to be much more than we think—and it is well worth picking up for an enlightening glimpse of a population that has been ascribed infamy without being known much at all.

University of Kansas

Ben Chappell


Cellphones exploded onto the U.S. scene, going from commercial launch in the mid-1980s to 88% penetration by 2008 and penetrating still further in Ling’s Norway. They clearly enable us to be in contact when we previously couldn’t. And they have become a cultural icon: cellphone-shaped balloons, parents hearing kids feigning adult cellphone conversations on their toys—“have your secretary call my secretary.”

Undoubtedly cellphones can challenge social norms. A few examples suffice:

- A couple walking down street together with each talking to someone else on a cellphone.
• A plumber summoned to Ling’s Oslo house for a leak strolled into Ling’s home as house guests were saying goodbye. The plumber’s refusal to interrupt his call to introduce himself, or ask permission to enter, violated Ling’s sense of social norms, not repaired by the plumber’s nodding to Ling and removing his shoes per the Norwegian custom.

• Whether we should flush when someone in the adjacent bathroom stall is on an important call.

• What cellphone conversations should be off-limits in public?

Rich Ling tackles such social implications of the cellphone—an understudied phenomenon relative to the Internet, perhaps because the cellphone seemed like a nifty phone with an infinitely long extension cord whereas the Internet was *sui generis*. Ling concludes that the cellphone strengthens our “bounded solidarity” with our stronger ties like friends and family by enabling us to contact them “24-7” at the expense of those physically proximate.

*What I liked about the book:*

• First, beginning with a solid dose of classic sociology and social capital, Ling skillfully unpacks the hidden nuances and social dance of cellphone calls and texting across lots of settings (joking, banter, gossip, flirting) and acknowledges cellphones’ role in microcoordination, and extending our sense of safety and security.

• In so doing, Ling helps us (a la William Whyte) to view the mundane of cellphone calls through an insightful inward lens: e.g., how a cellphone ringing during a funeral requires the receiver of the “erupting” call to balance the competing social claims on his time, figure out which is dominant, and be “co-present” in both spaces. Or how calls pre- or post-meeting can extend the impact of the “flesh time”? Or understanding the social processing occurring among teens texting during class.

• Third, Ling reveals interesting new facts: e.g., 34% of 19-24 year-olds find it easier to express feelings on SMS than face-to-face (F2F) or by phone (167). I was heartened that cellphones may hence lower the barriers for teen flirting (123-129) while simultaneously worrying that SMS may undermine useful learning in how to express F2F feelings.

*How the book could have been made stronger:*

• First, as interesting as the book was, its hypothesis did not seem brittle: what could Ling have learned from listening to calls to question his hypothesis that cell ritual was not being enacted and solidarity built. (If a hypothesis can’t be disproven, it is a definitional truism, not a hypothesis.) I wasn’t persuaded by Ling’s invocation of cellphone usage as “totem” and felt Ling could have reached similar conclusions via bonding and bridging social capital. Ling seems to want to posit that all this mundane communications lead to social cohesion, but the ritual analogy seems stretched unless any social interaction is ritualistic. Moreover, it seems equally plausible that many mundane
or shallow conversations (“do we need milk?”, “where is the car parked?”, “I’ll call you when I get to the office”, “can you hear me now?”); could as easily erode meaningful social ties as strengthen them. The impact must be contextual which is hard to fathom since Ling listens only to one side of conversations. (Ling does review some of the evidence in Chaps. 9-10: e.g., heavy cellphone users are more integrated into peer groups and texting and cellphone usage was positively correlated with F2F time within a 25 minute radius).

- Second, Ling’s conclusion seems to paradigmatically pit cellphone calls with stronger ties against potential co-present socialization with weaker ties. By ignoring the role of business cell calls (the elephant in the room), he avoids assessing whether business cellphone calls are undermining closer ties (e.g., when your date is interrupted by your lover’s work call). Ling further ignores how cell calls might inhibit social solidarity (dropped calls or inaudible calls) or the power dynamic of calls (faked calls to get out of meetings), cellphone blocking, or whether one provides one’s cellphone number.

- Third, there is little discussion of the counterfactual. Cellphone usage is socializing, but its social capital cost-benefit ledger depends on what’s displaced: e.g., I would expect more socializing without cellphones at one’s kids’ soccer game or while having lunch with friends than waiting for a subway or stuck alone in a traffic jam. This doesn’t seem to enter into Ling’s analysis.

- Fourth, while Ling acknowledges “civil inattention” (the difficulties of multi-tasking), there was little psychological or sociological quantification of this. This divided attention could lead those on the cell call and those around the caller to both feel less connected with the caller. The book lacks a strong framework for analyzing this. And are younger people more skilled multitaskers that enable them to better juggle these two social interactions?

- Finally, I wished I had a better sense of whether Ling’s observed and described conversations were typical of what he heard or just illustrative of a point Ling wanted to make.

Ling’s bottom-line finding—we can’t be here and “there” (or on the call) simultaneously—is sensible but less novel. Sociologist Ithiel de Sola Pool, landmark telephone researcher, noted how a 1975 Manhattan fire that knocked out phone service on the Lower East Side both made individuals feel isolated and increased F2F socializing. (Social Impact of the Telephone, 246-61).

This is an interesting book on an important topic, but one that could have been still stronger.

Harvard University
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